

# Modern Philology

VOLUME XVII

January 1920

NUMBER 9

## THE TRAVELLING PLAYERS IN SHAKSPERE'S ENGLAND

"How chances it they travel?" inquires Hamlet, when "the tragedians of the city" are announced. "Their *residence*, both in reputation and profit, was better both ways."<sup>1</sup> Shakspeare's testimony as to the inferior rewards open to the players "on the road" has had many an echo since, for then as now the reputation and profit of the great metropolitan centers of dramatic activity—the Bankside and the Blackfriars, Broadway and the Strand—have been the goal of "the quality" and the subject matter of students of dramatic history. And yet the humbler Elizabethan actors who travelled "softly on the hoof"<sup>2</sup> through the length and breadth of merry England contributed no small share to the making of the national drama which remains one of the glories of their spacious times.

Many an interesting record has come down to us of the good-humored but irresponsible strolling players who were content to

travel with pumps full of gravel  
Made of all such running leather  
That once in a week new masters we seek  
And never can hold together.<sup>3</sup>

It is more important to bear in mind that many of the great tragedians of the city trod the boards in country towns frequently and

<sup>1</sup> *Hamlet*, II, 2, 352.

<sup>2</sup> *Vox Graculi*; see Collier, *Annals*, ed. 1831, III, 310.

<sup>3</sup> *Histrion-Mastix* (1599), II, 251.

profitably. Among them were such distinguished actors as Henslowe's son-in-law, Edward Alleyn, and his colleagues, Singer and Towne,<sup>1</sup> and Shakspeare's friends and fellow actors, Thomas Pope, Augustine Phillips, William Kemp, and John Hemings, business manager of the Shakspeare-Burbage forces.<sup>2</sup> And there is every reason to believe that Shakspeare played with his company in the provinces, even though his name has not yet been found in the town records. Singer and Kemp, whose names do appear, tried their hand as playwrights as well as in acting. I have shown elsewhere that a very large number of Elizabethan playwrights—Ben Jonson, Heywood, Nathaniel Field, Richard Brome, to mention only a few of the leading names—were recruited from the ranks of the actors.<sup>3</sup> These actor-playwrights profited magnificently by their opportunity of viewing the life of their time in the large, of examining with equally open eyes the hucksters of Bartholomew Fair and the rustic philosophers of Stratford and Gloucestershire.

And yet the curiously interesting circumstances and conditions of the provincial drama have been neglected or ignored by most students of the period. Miss Gildersleeve, for example, fails to include in her "hierarchy of dramatic rulers"—the Privy Council, the Lord Chamberlain, and the King<sup>4</sup>—an almost equally important element: "Mr. Mayor" and the town councils. Many valuable compilations of the dramatic records of various towns and localities have been produced, but nothing approaching a synthetic study of the extant materials has yet appeared. The most valuable contribution of recent times in this field is John T. Murray's compilation of materials in the second volume of his *English Dramatic Companies* (1910), and his earlier article based on some of these materials.<sup>5</sup> This article, however, was written before he had completed his investigation, and its conclusions were necessarily, as Murray says, "more or less tentative." His later collections and

<sup>1</sup> *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. Greg, I, 4 and 6.

<sup>2</sup> Halliwell-Phillips, *Illustrations*, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> See chapter 6 of my MS dissertation, *Finance and Business Management of the Elizabethan Theatre*, Harvard University, 1918.

<sup>4</sup> *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*, p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> See *Modern Philology*, II (1905), 539-59. Murray's book on the subject, promised some time since, has not yet appeared.

additional materials which I have gathered from other sources make available much information not hitherto accessible to the general student. It is the purpose of this article to present in short compass some of the conclusions derivable from these materials.

We may begin with a glance at the strollers and vagabonds of Elizabethan drama. These players were frequently made the butt of contemporary jibes, and it appears that they paced the open road humbly enough. One of the earliest extant records of them, an entry from the exchequer accounts of Henry VII, suggests something of their low estate. In the year 1493 the King gave largesse of 6s. 8d. "to the players that begged by the way."<sup>1</sup> Nor did the strollers of the next century fare much better, if we may believe Thomas Dekker. The poet of *The Gentle Craft* did not always deal gently with the misfortunes of his fellows, and yet his picture of their indigent condition makes good contemporary evidence. In his *Belman of London* (1608), Dekker takes a fling at certain "Players . . . who, out of an ambition to weare the Best Ierkin (in a Strowling Company) or to Act Great Parts forsake the stately Cittie Stages to trauel upon ye hard hoofe from village to village for chees and buttermilke."<sup>2</sup> Again, in his *Newes from Hell* (1606), he transcribes a leaf from Charon's account book: "Item, lent to a Companie of country players, being nine in number, one sharer & the rest Iorneymen that with strowling were brought to deaths door, XIIIId. ob., upon their stocke of apparell, to pay for their boat hire, because they would trie if they could be suffred to play in the diuels name."<sup>3</sup> The last phrase of the passage obviously refers to the Statute of 1572, by which unlicensed players were threatened with branding as "rogues, vagabonds and sturdy beggars."<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to note further that Dekker's nondescript company of nine, "one sharer & the rest Iorneymen," is paralleled by other evidence, later and more specific. Richard Bradshawe, one-time servant of Gabriel Spencer, the actor who enjoyed the distinction of being killed by Ben Jonson,<sup>5</sup> forsook the city stages

<sup>1</sup> Malone's *Shakspere*, ed. Boswell, III, 43.

<sup>2</sup> Grosart's *Dekker*, III, 81.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 146.

<sup>4</sup> Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, p. 27; Thorndike, *Shakespeare's Theatre*, p. 204.

<sup>5</sup> Henslowe's *Diary*, II, 243, 313.

sometime before 1633. In that year his company of seven was arrested at Banbury because its license was believed to be fraudulent, and all its members testify that Bradshawe alone was "master," the rest being apprenticed to serve him for seven years for "nothing but meat and drink."<sup>1</sup> And yet even the more soundly constituted companies—organizations that boasted full complements of "sharers"<sup>2</sup>—were sometimes in almost as heavy case as Dekker's hopeless crew. Pembroke's Men, for example, travelled happily into the provinces in 1593, only to be stranded on the road and forced to pawn their properties.<sup>3</sup>

The passage from *Histrion-Mastix* quoted above points at one of the difficulties experienced by the strollers—that of "holding together." Even the best of the London companies—Shakspere's among them—had to use elaborate safeguards to keep their members from seeking all too frequent changes of scene.<sup>4</sup> The road companies, having fewer advantages to offer, must have found this problem much more difficult to solve, and their managers were frequently embarrassed by the tardiness or disappearance of actors entrusted with important parts. The lateness of Bottom the Weaver, and the non-appearance of one of the important actors in the play of *Sir Thomas More*<sup>5</sup> probably had many a counterpart on provincial stages.

Nor were the absent members always to blame, for sometimes their non-appearance was brought about by causes beyond their control. The strollers, even if they avoided the letter of the statute against masterless men, were ready victims for the recruiting officer's press gang. "Press money!" exclaims a sadly surprised player in *Histrion-Mastix*, "alas, sir, press me? I am no fit actor for the action!" But the recruiting officer is not to be denied. "Text-bills," he insists, "must now be turned to iron-bills."<sup>6</sup> The licenses of the great London companies specifically protected them from

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 163.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., actors who had graduated from the "hireling" or apprentice stage and had become investors in the capital of their company and sharers in its profits.

<sup>3</sup> Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, p. 32; Murray, *E.D.C.*, I, 65.

<sup>4</sup> Compare chapter 2 of my dissertation.

<sup>5</sup> *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, IV, 2; *Sir Thomas More*, IV, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Act V.

interference of this sort,<sup>1</sup> but their humbler brethren had no recourse except to suit the word even to this sort of action. Again, the strollers were subject to retributive justice—or malice—dispensed by petty local functionaries whose officiousness they delighted to ridicule in their plays. Justice Clack, in Brome's *Jovial Crew* (1641), cools his wrath at the players and illustrates our point. "They can act Justices, can they?" he suggests; "I'll act a Justice among 'em: that is to say, I will do justice upon them."<sup>2</sup>

In fairness to Justice Clack and his kind we are obliged to add that certain elements among the strollers were a sore burden to the constituted authorities. Beggary was not the sole offense of the strollers. The actors in *Histrion-Mastix* describe a rival company as an aggregation of "coney catchers that cousen mayors,"<sup>3</sup> and the merry crew of "comedians, tragi-comedians, comi-tragedians, pastorists, humorists, satirists," who hold forth in Middleton's *Mayor of Queenborough* (ca. 1602), meet the description to a nicety. They throw flour into Mr. Mayor's eyes and, having stolen his purse, leave His Honor to derive such comfort as he can from his clerk's explanation: "You are cozened, Sir; they are all professed cheaters. . . . They only take the name of country comedians to abuse simple people with a printed play or two which they bought at Canterbury for sixpence."<sup>4</sup> Similar exploits enacted by other "roguish players" might be recounted,<sup>5</sup> but we must leave the strollers here to look into the affairs of the companies that had more reputation and profit to lose.

We have seen that the names of some of the most distinguished Elizabethan actors appear in the provincial records. It is safe to add that without the resource of going into the country when acting in London was unprofitable or impossible, even the best of the city companies could hardly have survived. The conditions which periodically forced the players to travel are well known, and a rapid summary will suffice to recall them to the reader. The

<sup>1</sup> See my dissertation, chapter 5.

<sup>2</sup> V, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Act V.

<sup>4</sup> V, 1. Cf. Percy Simpson, *Shakespeare's England*, II, 240.

<sup>5</sup> See T. S. Graves, *Modern Philology*, IX, 431, on the famous *England's Joy* episode at the Swan Theatre in 1602, and compare pp. 507-8, below, on a similar exploit ascribed to Peele.

ravages of the plague again and again led to an inhibition of acting in the metropolis, and brought about a steady exodus of actors, sometimes for periods of many months in successive years.<sup>1</sup> The closing of part or all of the London theatres at times when the Puritan opposition was able to dominate the situation led to the same result, as did also the very frequent occurrence of theater fires in London.<sup>2</sup> Another driving force was the keen competition among the companies in London—such competition, for example, as that between the children's companies and the adult actors to which Shakspeare alludes in *Hamlet*.<sup>3</sup> More important, perhaps, was the sharp rivalry for public favor among the adult companies themselves.<sup>4</sup>

Nor was competition eliminated when the players left the city. Managers anxious to steal a march upon their rivals were none too scrupulous in their methods. Certain playwrights also—Robert Greene and perhaps Thomas Dekker among them, if contemporary allusions may be trusted—were sometimes guilty of sharp practice. A familiar passage from *The Defense of Conny Catching* (1592) would seem to indicate that on one occasion Greene profited by the synchronous absence of copyright protection and of a certain company with which he had had business relations:

Aske the Queens Players if you solde them not *Orlando Furioso* for twenty Nobles and when they were in the country sold the same play to the Lord Admirals men for as much more? Was not this plaine Conny-catching, Maister R. G.?<sup>5</sup>

Somewhat later the Admiral's Men may have been concerned in a similar transaction, in which Thomas Dekker and Shakspeare's company also appear as principals. On January 30, 1599, Henslowe significantly records a loan of 3*l.* 10*s.* to the Admiral's Men "to descarge Thomas dickers from the a reaste of my lord chamberlens men."<sup>6</sup>

A more serious abuse than the stealing of plays, however, was the stealing or forging of licenses. A notable dispute at Leicester

<sup>1</sup> See Fleay's *Stage*, and Murray, *E.D.C.*, I, 155, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Fires at the Globe, the Fortune, the Rose, and the Blackfriars are recorded.

<sup>3</sup> II, 2, 361.

<sup>4</sup> See my dissertation, chapter 6.

<sup>5</sup> See Grosart's *Greene*, XI, 75.

<sup>6</sup> *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 101.

in 1583, between Worcester's Men and those of Edmund Tilney, Master of the Revels, may serve as a case in point. Tilney's Men reached the mayor first, and were permitted to play. The other company received a gratuity of 10s., and orders to leave the town. Thereupon they marched "with drum & Trumppytts thorowe the Towne in contempt of Mr. Mayor," and then calmly put on their play, Mr. Mayor to the contrary notwithstanding. By way of excuse for their action Worcester's Men urged that their rivals "were not lawfully authoryzed & that they had taken from them there comysion." Tilney's company categorically denied the charge, but the Mayor settled the controversy by accepting the apology of Worcester's Men and authorizing them to stay on.<sup>1</sup> Whatever the merits of this particular case may have been, it is clear that many similar irregularities occurred. Their causes are not far to seek. After 1581 each and every company was required by law to obtain a license from the Master of the Revels, and that official made heavy demands upon the financial resources of the players, his fees being limited only by his judgment of what the market would bear.<sup>2</sup> Bartholomew Jones, one of the witnesses in the Bradshawe case at Danbury in 1633, testifies that "the Master of the Revels will give allowance to the raising [of the license] if he be paid,"<sup>3</sup> so that the trouble there seems to have resulted only from the manager's inability to pay the five or ten pounds which were probably required.<sup>4</sup> By 1633, however, licenses were not to be had freely, even though the applicants were able to pay. In that year witnesses stated that the Bradshawe license had been sold in turn to at least three different managers, and that Bradshawe "gave 20s. in earnest for this commission, and was to pay either 10l. or 20l."<sup>5</sup> It must be remembered that in order to gain legal standing, a company besides paying its license fee had to find some nobleman willing to lend it his name or "countenance."

<sup>1</sup> Kelly, *Notices of the Drama at Leicester*, p. 213.

<sup>2</sup> See my dissertation, chapter 6, section 4.

<sup>3</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 164; Collier, *Annals*, II, 48-49. "Raising" means "renewal."

<sup>4</sup> If we may judge from the rates charged the city companies. The sum in question (between \$200 and \$400 in our money, allowance being made for the greater purchasing power of Elizabethan money) was no small item for those days and circumstances.

<sup>5</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 165.

Minor companies doubtless experienced difficulty in finding such patrons. At all events, more or less illegitimate trading in players' licenses had come to be a considerable annoyance to the authorities at least ten years before the Bradshawe case, for in 1622 we find Pembroke, the Lord Chamberlain, writing to provincial officials to forbid transactions whereby irresponsible companies, for "whome such grants & lycences were nevr. intended . . . are suffered to have free passage."<sup>1</sup> The stealing of plays and licenses was symptomatic of the keen competition among the travelling players. Some allowance for the sharp practice then in vogue may well be made, however, in view of the fact that the players had not only to compete with rivals of their own "quality," but also with hordes of jugglers, exhibitors of puppet-shows, dancers, sleight-of-hand artists, and miscellaneous performers of all kinds. And there were other difficulties.

It was formerly believed that the Puritan opposition was not serious in the provinces,<sup>2</sup> but the contrary is true. The documents prove beyond a doubt that many towns made holiday when the players came, and supported them in something of the same spirit that still finds expression in the receptions accorded to Chautauqua organizations in our own rural districts. But the documents prove just as clearly that from about 1600 to the closing of the theaters in 1642 the Puritan opposition in the provinces as well as in London became increasingly troublesome. Indeed, certain notoriously puritanical towns had come to be bywords among the players even in the first decades of the seventeenth century. Banbury, the scene of Bradshawe's troubles, was so prominent an offender that Ben Jonson in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) freely labels Zeal-of-the-Land Busy "a Banbury man." Later in the play, when the elder feels called upon to rehearse all the stock arguments against tolerance for the players, the poet scathingly enlarges upon Busy's "Banbury vapours."<sup>3</sup> The University of Cambridge, as early as 1592, protested to the Privy Council because certain players, in defiance of

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 351-52.

<sup>2</sup> Murray (*Modern Philology*, II, 557) held this view, and took sharp exception to Courthope's position in this connection (*History of English Poetry*, IV, 391).

<sup>3</sup> V, 3.

orders prohibiting their appearance within five miles of the University, "sett vp their bills" upon the very gates of the colleges.<sup>1</sup> In 1604 the Duke of Lenox wrote to "all maiors and Justices of the peas" to urge forbearance of opposition to his "servants . . . in the exercise of their plays,"<sup>2</sup> but in that very year the town of Cambridge once more forbade all plays, in order to put a stop to the corruption of manners "in the younger sort."<sup>3</sup> Exeter in 1618 took similar action on the ground that "those who spend their money on plays are ordinarily very poor people,"<sup>4</sup> and so did Norwich in 1623, "by reason of the want of worke for the poor & in respect of the contagion feared and for many other causes."<sup>5</sup> In short, it is clear that such towns as Exeter, Dover, Barnstaple, Canterbury, and Plymouth, which until about 1610 had supported visiting players with numerous grants from their town funds, practically closed their doors to them thereafter. In some cases, however, the towns were still willing to pay them gratuities "for putting them off," that is, "for not suffering them to play"<sup>6</sup>—in short, to speed them on their way elsewhere with a fee meant to express the town's respect for the patron who had lent his name to the players: "for their L. and Mr. his sake," as a Norwich entry has it.<sup>7</sup> Barnstaple between 1618 and 1637 allowed but two companies to play, whereas eleven companies were bought off "to ridd the Towne of them." Dover after 1610 made payment for but two town plays, though it records thirty-five gratuities "upon benevolence . . . to dept. the cittie & not to play," and Canterbury took much the same action.<sup>8</sup> Many towns remained open to the players until the close of our period, but the evidence here cited certainly indicates that in its later decades the Puritan opposition

<sup>1</sup> *Malone Society Collections*, I, 2, 191-202. Both universities, of course, furnished dramatic entertainment from time to time to Elizabeth and her successors, but the authorities did not take kindly to the professional players until Restoration times. Cf. *Mal. Soc. Coll.*, I, 3, 247, and W. J. Lawrence, *Elizabethan Playhouse*, II, 192.

<sup>2</sup> Warner, *Cat. Dulwich Coll. MSS.*, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 220 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Collier, I, 369; Fleay, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-21; Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 6, 253-54.

<sup>5</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 347.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 270, 258.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 25, 337.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 197-200, 258-67, 221-34.

made the struggle for existence much severer for the travelling companies than it had been.

These were the decades also when they felt most strongly the competition of showmen not connected with the legitimate drama. In some of the town records the payments to the regular companies are almost entirely crowded out by rewards granted to manipulators of "Italian motions" or puppet-shows—the "movies" of Elizabethan times—and to miscellaneous tricksters and jugglers. The Coventry records for the years 1624 to 1642 are particularly illuminating in this connection. During these years the town allowed payment for many interesting entertainments on the occasion of the first appearance of the artists in question. Thus it granted 3s. 4d. to one Richard Thompson, "who had a commission to play the Worlds wonder," and 12s. to three performers "who had a motion to shew expressing the worlds abuses." Still better fared Christopher Thomson, who "came with Commission to shew the Creation of the world" and won an official reward of 13s. 4d. "Walter Neare that went about to show a child borne without armes," and "a soldier that tossed a Pike at the Crosse before Mr. Maior and his Bretheren," made a less favorable impression and got but 2s. 6d. and 18d., respectively. Other performers did better. "An Italian that thrust himself under the side to make experiment of his oyle," Bartholomew Cloys "for shewing a musical organ with divers strang and rare motions," and "one John Shepheard . . . who came wth. commission to shew a sow with 6 hoggs," drew five or six shillings each, whereas during the same years the town repeatedly paid but two or three shillings by way of reward for official first performances by regular dramatic companies. Between 1636 and 1642 Coventry made thirteen payments to tricksters such as the gentleman with the sow and hogs and divers other strange and rare motions, and but ten payments for legitimate plays.<sup>1</sup>

The actors, however, were quick to respond to the demands of their public, and soon began to appear with certain "special" or "added" attractions of their own. Thus "the Kings Players

<sup>1</sup> For the materials quoted see Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 235-54, and II, 340 for similar items at Norwich.

and hocus pocus" arrived in Coventry in 1638 (the year of Mr. Richard Thompson and the World's Wonder, and but one year before John Shepherd and his hogs) and the King's Men and their assisting artist led all the rest, for the town fathers gave them a reward of 20s.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile the players "of the Earle of Essex & the Turk"—without question another redoubtable tumbler or juggler—had earned a fee of 40s. elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> From Marlowe to Shakspeare and Jonson, the playwrights rebelled at the low conceits which clownage keeps in pay—the antics of the clowns and buffoons which the astonishing elasticity of Elizabethan taste applauded and supported almost as liberally as it did its Tamberlaines, its Alchemists, and its Hamlets. It was left for Ben Jonson to express most clearly the playwrights' objection to the growing taste for jugglery and buffoonery which signalized the period of the decline. "Do they think this pen can juggle?" inquires *Damn-Play* in *The Magnetic Lady* (1632); "I would we had Hokos-pokos for 'em, then, or Travitanto Tudesco."<sup>3</sup>

The players learned to meet in still another way the difficulties created by the ever increasing competition for the favor of the public. We have seen what happened when Worcester's Men and Tilney's simultaneously claimed the plaudits and the shillings of the city of Worcester in 1583. Later companies realized that co-operation may at times be more profitable than competition and court proceedings. They hit upon the simple expedient of joining forces, doubtless with an eye to the advertising value of an arrangement which may have been forced upon them by sheer necessity. Such arrangements had, indeed, high precedent in their favor. Thus the two leading companies of London, the Admiral's Men and the Chamberlain's Men, are known to have played together before Queen Elizabeth in 1586.<sup>4</sup> From the records of Newcastle-on-Tyne we learn that its town fathers enjoyed a similar distinction not long after, for in 1593 they granted the sum of 30s. "to my Lord Admiralls plaiers and my Lord Morleis plaiers being all in one

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 253.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 313.

<sup>3</sup> I, 1. Tudesco was a famous Italian juggler. For another allusion to Hokos-pokos, see *The Staple of News*, II, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Halliwell-Phillips, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

company."<sup>1</sup> So too when on March 20, 1616, trouble threatened between the advance agents of Queen Anne's Men and the representatives of "the Prince's servants," who came on the same day to book their companies with the authorities of Norwich, the matter was compromised, "and theise two companys" together were given "leave to play flower days this next weke."<sup>2</sup> Other cases of this sort are on record, but sufficient evidence has been cited to establish our general point—that competition was keen, that the players had at times to face sharp rivalry from non-legitimate performers and strong opposition from the authorities, but that, on the whole, they learned to adapt themselves to the situation. It remains to examine the evidence concerning the expenses and the income of the provincial companies, their methods of financing their trips, and the manner of their reception by the towns they visited.

Since the provinces had no playhouses properly speaking, the travelling players were not required to find money for the building and upkeep of theaters, as were their London colleagues.<sup>3</sup> Like them, however, their sharers had to provide capital for the expenses of production—costuming, playwrights' fees, lighting, the wages of the inferior actors or "hirelings"—and for travelling expenses. We have already seen that in such humble organizations as that of Bradshawe the whole burden rested upon the single manager and owner, who likewise appropriated any profit that might be earned. *Henslowe's Diary* indicates clearly, however, that when the stronger companies went on tour their actor-sharers raised money toward the company equipment fund much as they sometimes did on preparing for a London season. On May 3, 1593, Henslowe notes that his nephew, Francis Henslowe, borrowed from him the sum of 15*l*. "for his share to the Quenes players when they broke & went into the contrey."<sup>4</sup> Two years later came a loan of 9*l*. "for his halfe share with the company wch. he dothe play wth.,"<sup>5</sup> and still a third entry, probably of the year 1604, shows Henslowe lending his

<sup>1</sup> See Richard Welford, 10 *Notes & Queries*, XII, 222.

<sup>2</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 340.

<sup>3</sup> For a full discussion of London playhouse and company finance see chapters 2 and 6 of my dissertation.

<sup>4</sup> *Diary*, I, 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 6.

nephew 7*l.* to "goyn wth. owld Garland & symcockes & sauery when they played in the duckes nam at ther last goinge owt."<sup>1</sup> This entry does not necessarily indicate that only Garland, Simcock, and Savery were young Henslowe's fellow-sharers when the Duke's Men went on tour in 1604. We shall see in a moment that respectable travelling companies averaged some six or eight full sharers. Since Francis Henslowe borrowed 15*l.* and 9*l.* for his "share" and "half-share" respectively, it would follow that the travelling companies of which he was a member started with a capital of 100 to 150*l.* or its equivalent in properties. From other sources it appears that a single share in the stock of Worcester's Men, a travelling company in 1589, sold for 37*l.* 10*s.*<sup>2</sup>—in other words, that the total stock of that company was probably worth some 200*l.* Provincial playgoers in their own degree were as fond of gorgeous costume and expensive show as the gallants and groundlings of the metropolis.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the cost of Elizabethan theatrical apparel was so high<sup>4</sup> that a capital of 100 to 200*l.* would have been none too much to provide the necessary equipment and to leave a working reserve for travelling expenses. "Our companie is greate," complain the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1592, "and thearbie our chardge intollerable in travellinge the countrie, and the contynuanee therof wilbe a meane to bring us to division and separation."<sup>5</sup>

Not the least difficult of the problems to be faced by the managers of the travelling companies must have been that of limiting expenses by keeping down the number of actors. Their plays required such large casts—Shakspere's, for example, averaging twenty-five speaking parts—that it must have been difficult to draw the line between the conflicting demands of the stage and business managers. Murray puts the usual number of actors in a travelling company of any importance at about ten or eleven,<sup>6</sup> and this estimate will serve as well as any that could be reached. It

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 160; II, 267.

<sup>2</sup> Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, p. 4. Cf. Henslowe's *Diary*, II, 130.

<sup>3</sup> See Malone *Soc. Coll.*, I, 247–59; Dibdin, *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage*, pp. 8–9; Collier, *Annals*, I, 9; Kelly, *Notices of the Drama at Leicester*, pp. 19, 24, 61. On silk robes used by travelling players, see quotation from Peele's *Jests*, below, p. 508.

<sup>4</sup> See chapter 6 of my dissertation.

<sup>5</sup> Warner, *op. cit.*, p. 11; Murray, *E.D.C.*, I, 88; II, 127–28.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 88.

may be worth while, however, to give some indication of the evidence on the subject. The earliest companies, naturally, were the smallest, unless we except the obscure strollers of later times. Thus we learn from the Household Book of Lord Howard, afterward Duke of Norfolk, that this nobleman "on Crystemas daye [1482] gaff to *IIII* players of my Lord Gloucestres" the sum of 3s. 4d.,<sup>1</sup> and the strollers who entertain More and Erasmus in *Sir Thomas More* (ca. 1599) manage with "Foure men and a boy."<sup>2</sup> An equal economy of means is practiced by Sir Oliver Owlet's Men in *Histrionastix*. Sir Oliver's Men number "but four or five"—whereby, as the poet Posthaste remarks, "they are the liker to thrive."<sup>3</sup>

Posthaste to the contrary notwithstanding, the town records prove that the more thriving companies had larger resources in man power, though the number of actors varies from town to town and from year to year. "My lorde Sussexe players, *being VI men*," appeared at Ludlow in 1570,<sup>4</sup> and the travelling license of the Chamberlain's Men for 1593 enumerates seven performers, though the list is probably incomplete.<sup>5</sup> Worcester's Men at Norwich in 1583 had at least ten "Players & servants," and "the lady Elizabeth's Players" at Plymouth in 1618 employed the respectable number of "20 persons, wch. had the King's hand for playing as well by night as by day."<sup>6</sup> Other entries place the number of actors at 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, and 18, respectively,<sup>7</sup> and the average lies between 10 and 12. We may add that the Lady Elizabeth's Company of twenty probably included six or eight hirelings, whose demands upon the company treasury would have been moderate even if they received something more than bread and meat by way of remuneration. Henslowe once more helps us here, for Edward Alleyn's transcript of one of his father-in-law's entries shows that in at least one case a hireling expressly agreed to accept, while playing in the country, one-half of his London wages of 10s. a week.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> IV, 1, 53.

<sup>3</sup> I, 1, 154.

<sup>4</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 324.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 88; Halliwell-Phillips, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>6</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 336, 385.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 333, 103, 254-55.

<sup>8</sup> Henslowe agreed to give William Kendall (Dec. 8, 1597) "everi week of his playing in london Xs, & in ye cuntrie Vs" (*Diary*, I, XLIX).

Our materials make possible a somewhat more definite view of the income than of the expenses of the provincial companies. We shall see that in spite of the "intollerable chardge" they had to meet, when conditions were favorable their sharers had something to look forward to besides the "chees and buttermilke" at which Dekker scornfully put their part in the gains.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence, in fact, proves conclusively that the players frequently enjoyed much more substantial cheer, and with it certainly more comfort than fell to the lot of Dekker in his all too frequent sojourns in the prisons of London. "Wine & chirries," "junktets & bankets," "dynner wth beere & bysketts" and "musyck" and much good "sacke"—such items appear with pleasing regularity in the expense accounts of the town fathers who provided the players with these sound refreshments at the public charge "to welcome them to towne" or to wish them God-speed with "a breakfaste at their deptime."; all this perhaps after making additional provision for the purchase of certain "loads of coal" and "links for lights"—"to keep the actors warm"—and properly illuminated, one is tempted to add, in case the sack ran short.<sup>2</sup> The custom is worth something more than passing notice. These "junctets with Mr. Mair and his brotherne"<sup>3</sup> did not in themselves perhaps represent a large credit item on the books of the company business manager, but they speak eloquently of the hearty reception accorded the players in normal times. Possibly these feasts did not provide for more than an occasional change from Dekker's "chees and buttermilke," and yet they came often enough to win the notice of still another redoubtable commentator upon the life of the times. Ben Jonson has Cokes in *Bartholomew Fair* score a point for the puppets, the actors of the "Italian motions," over "the great players": "I like 'em for that . . . there goes not so much charge to the feasting of them, or making them drunk, as to the other, by reason of their littleness."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 491.

<sup>2</sup> See Dibdin, *op. cit.*, p. 9; Richard Welford, 10 *Notes & Queries*, XII, 222; Watts, *Theatrical Bristol*, p. 4; G. D. Rendel, *Newcastle-on-Tyne*, p. 10; and Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 259, 380, 392, 362, 365, 324, 228-31, etc. Murray (*Modern Philology*, II, 548) notes that the towns "sometimes" paid for the players' ale or wine, but does not indicate that the practice was widespread and well established.

<sup>3</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 220.

<sup>4</sup> V, 3.

The drinkings and banquetings, moreover, made but a part of the substantial advantages derived by the players from the public receptions given them by the towns they visited. Many years ago Malone called attention to the fact that the town fathers regularly attended the opening performance in state, and rewarded the actors from the public funds. The documents bearing on this point have been repeatedly discussed,<sup>1</sup> but they may be made to yield more information than has yet appeared. Malone's quotation from R. Willis' *Mount Tabor* (1659) deserves repetition here:

In the city of Gloucester the manner is (as I think it is in other like corporations) that when players of enterludes come to towne, they first attend the Mayor, to enforme him what nobleman's servants they are, and so to get license to play their first play before himself and the Aldermen and Common Counsell of the city, and that is called the Mayor's play: where everyone that will comes in without money, the Mayor giving the players a reward as he thinks fit to shew respect unto them.<sup>2</sup>

The passage is indispensable—but not altogether trustworthy, nor does it tell the whole story. It may well be supplemented by an entry from the Leicester records of the year 1553, which indicates that Mr. Mayor and the aldermen did not always stand upon ceremony, but on at least one occasion were quite ready to honor the players at a moment's notice, even though they had to sacrifice an official dinner of good vension upon the altar of Thalia or Melpomene. In that year the Council made allowance "for the expences that went to the buck that my lady of Huntynghton gave to the XLVIII,<sup>3</sup> which was ordeyned at the hall for the Company & they cam not because of the play that was in the Church."<sup>4</sup>

It is well to bear in mind the advertising value of these public receptions and official first performances over and above the rewards in pounds, shillings, and pence. Indeed, a further word on theatrical advertising in the country may be in order before we seek to estimate the earnings of the players from official grants and popular "gatherings."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Murray, *Modern Philology*, II, 539-50.

<sup>2</sup> Malone, *op. cit.*, III, 28.

<sup>3</sup> I.e., the town council.

<sup>4</sup> Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

I have already referred to the custom of sending advance agents to make the necessary arrangements, and to that of posting bills to advertise plays.<sup>1</sup> A more spectacular part of the Elizabethan publicity man's work was to arrange for circus processions through the towns to announce the presence of the players. Many a hireling in his time "led the drum before the English comedians"<sup>2</sup> in their travels through provincial England, sometimes against the wishes of the authorities. We have seen that in 1583 Worcester's Men went with drum and trumpet through the town of Leicester in defiance of its mayor,<sup>3</sup> and there is evidence of the same sort of high-handed procedure in Dover and even in London itself.<sup>4</sup> The advertising methods of the travelling company in *Histrion-Mastix* are of particular interest because in this case the instrumentalists of the company are not the only ones called upon to trumpet forth the quality of its wares. The players have just arrived in the market-place of a small town, where a crowd is gathered to bargain for country produce. One of the actors "steppes on the crosse and cryes 'A Play.'" He then illustrates our point and enables us to pass from the consideration of advertising methods to the counting of the gains, as follows:

All they that can sing and say  
Come to the Towne-house and see a play,  
At three o'clock it shall beginne—  
The finest play that ere was seene;  
Yet there is one thing more in my mind:  
*Take heed you leave not your purses behind.*<sup>5</sup>

The last line of this passage indicates that a first performance—a "town-play," as it is called in *Histrion-Mastix*—with all its official sanction and reward was not necessarily a performance "where everyone that will comes in without money," as the *Mount Tabor* passage has it. That it was sometimes free to the public appears from such records as those of Newcastle-on-Tyne for the year 1593,

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 500 and 497, and cf. W. J. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, II, 55.

<sup>2</sup> *All's Well That Ends Well*, IV, 3, 244. Maurice Jonas, *Shakespeare and the Stage*, p. 233, states that this passage "puzzled" him, but its significance is obvious after all.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 495.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Halliwell-Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32; Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 342; and chapter 3 of my dissertation.

<sup>5</sup> Act II.

when the town granted 3*l.* to Sussex's Men "in full paymente . . . for playing a free play."<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Murray has justly called attention to several entries covering official payments at Leicester which distinctly state that these were "over and above that was gathered" from the public at the doors.<sup>2</sup> And there is other evidence to the same effect.<sup>3</sup> We shall try to determine in a moment just what amounts the players derived from these town fees and public gatherings. Meanwhile we must note that Murray's attempt to decide this point on the basis of the Leicester entries for 1590 leads to unacceptable conclusions. One of these entries reads as follows: "Received of John Underwood, the Mayor's Sergeant, which was by him received of the *Mayors Brethren*<sup>4</sup> for 6 plays and one Bear Baiting—44*s.*" From this and certain other entries Murray infers that such items as the 44*s.* represent the *public gathering* over and above the town fee, and he concludes that the average takings at the door "seem to have been about 7*s.*," while the official rewards "vary from 10*s.* to 40*s.*"<sup>5</sup> It is difficult to believe that the players could have managed with such small average takings as 7*s.*, for we must bear in mind that the extra town fee was paid only for the first performance. Moreover, a highly advertised first performance must have drawn at least as large a public gathering as any that might be expected at subsequent plays, so that if we are to accept Murray's interpretation of these entries it would follow that a 7*s.* house was the best the players might expect at any time. But this interpretation is not valid. Murray for the moment overlooked the Leicester ordinance of 1566, which provided that "everyone of the *Mayors brethren* and of the forty-eight, being required to be [at the town play] shall bear everyone of them his . . . portion." This ordinance was passed because "the town stock has been much decayed by giving of great gifts."<sup>6</sup> Later council orders reiterated the provision that the aldermen must raise the town reward from their own pockets, and other towns took the

<sup>1</sup> See Richard Welford, 10 *Notes & Queries*, XII, 222.

<sup>2</sup> See *Modern Philology*, II, 547, and Kelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 194, 227.

<sup>3</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 202.

<sup>4</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>5</sup> *Med. Phil.*, II, 553-54.

<sup>6</sup> Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

same action.<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt that the entries Murray has mistaken for the totals of the public gatherings, represent merely certain contributions of "the mayor's brethren" toward the town fee. The town officials had no interest in the public gatherings, and their records throw no light upon that part of the players' income.

A passage from *Ratseis Ghost* (1606), a pamphlet celebrating the adventures of the redoubtable Gamaliell Ratsey, highwayman, does contribute certain information on this subject. Ratsey, we are told, fell in one day with a travelling company—"heard their play and seemed to like that . . . and verie liberally . . . gave them *fortie shillings*, with which they held themselves richly satisfied, for they scarce had *twentie shilling audience* . . . for a play in the country."<sup>2</sup> Ratsey, to be sure, immediately after relieved the players of their 40s. and also forced them to make him "a desperate tender of their stock," yet it is comforting to reflect upon the margin of difference between their usual 20s. receipts and the seven of Murray's estimate. Indeed a gathering of 40s. was probably by no means beyond the ken of the players. One of the *Jests* of George Peele (1607) may serve for further testimony on this point. According to the story, Peele had stayed in Bristol "somewhat longer than his coin would last him," his hard-hearted landlord thereupon attaching the poet's horse for security. A fortunate turn of circumstance enabled Peele and his Pegasus to beat a strategic but very successful retreat:

It so fortun'd that certain players came to the town . . . to whom George Peele was well known, being in that time an excellent poet. . . . There were not past three of the company come . . . the rest were behind . . . so that night they could not enact, which George hearing had presently a stratagem in his head. . . . He goes directly to the Mayor, tells him he . . . had a certain history of *The Knight of the Rhodes*, desiring the mayor that he with his presence . . . would grace his labours. The mayor agreed to it . . . but for himself he could not be there being in the evening, but . . . very liberally gave him an angel. . . . About his business [Peele] goes . . . hired the players' apparel to flourish out his show, promising to pay them liberally, and withal desired them they would favor him so much as to gather him his money at the door . . . George in the meantime, with the ten shillings he had of the

<sup>1</sup> Bridgenorth did, for example. See Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 206.

<sup>2</sup> Halliwell-Phillips, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

Mayor, delivered his horse out of Purgatory. . . . By this time the audience were come and some forty shillings gathered, which money George put in his purse, and, putting on one of the players silk robes after the trumpet had sounded thrice . . . down stairs goes he, gets to his horse, and so with forty shillings to London: leaves the players to answer it.<sup>1</sup>

Even a gathering of 40s. was only about a quarter of the average takings at the London playhouses,<sup>2</sup> and the probabilities are that the travelling companies occasionally drew much more.<sup>3</sup> The records of Bristol, the scene of Peele's fabled exploit, prove, at any rate, that they sometimes succeeded very well indeed in their efforts to attract a full audience. In 1576 the town paid 5s. 1d. for repairing the guildhall door and replacing "the cramp of yren weh . . . was stretched wth. the press of people at the play of my Lord Chamberleyns survts . . . before Mr. Mayor and thaldermen."<sup>4</sup> Again, though travelling charges may have been "intollerable," the cost of living was much lower in the country than in London.<sup>5</sup> We shall see presently, moreover, that the travelling players frequently doubled their earnings by giving two performances a day. And they had no playhouse charges to meet, for the town-hall, or sometimes the church, was to be had gratis. Queen Anne's warrant to her players in 1605 specifically commands all officers of towns and municipalities to "affourd them your Townehalls" or other suitable quarters for acting, "that they may be in better readiness for our service,"<sup>6</sup> and the licenses of the King's and the Prince's Men call for the same privilege.<sup>7</sup> Some of the towns objected to the custom. Chester, for example, in 1615, took exception to "the common . . . scandall . . . of late incurred . . . by admittinge of Stage Plaiers to act their obscene and unlawful plays . . . in the comon hall of the Citie, thereby convertinge the same, beinge

<sup>1</sup> See Bullen's *Peele*, II, 389; Watts, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

<sup>2</sup> See my article on "Shakspere's Income," *Studies in Philology*, XV, 89.

<sup>3</sup> A play produced in Malden, Essex, brought total receipts of over 7l. in 1540 (A. Clark, *10 Notes & Queries*, VII, 182). See also Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 388, on average receipts of 2l. 16s. at St. Ives, Cornwall.

<sup>4</sup> Watts, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> On comparative costs and wages see the extensive materials in Nichols' *Progresses* (Elizabeth and James) and cf. Feuillerat, *Revels Documents, Elizabeth*, p. 257; Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 214.

<sup>6</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 400.

<sup>7</sup> Malone *Soc. Coll.*, I, 268-69, 281.

appointed . . . for the judicial hearinge . . . of criminal offenses, into a stage for players and receptacle for idle persons."<sup>1</sup> Southampton and Worcester likewise objected,<sup>2</sup> and Mayor Simon of Queenborough, whom we have met earlier in this paper, was also of the opposition party. The players have asked his permission to give the usual official performance. "In the town-hall?" he queries; "'tis ten to one I never grant them that. . . . If my house will not serve their turn I would fain see the proudest he lend them a barn."<sup>3</sup> Most of the towns, however, did not object at all. The communities which delighted to entertain the players with good ale and wine and substantial dinners felt no hardship in welcoming them to their town-halls. At worst, when the business of the town pre-empted its hall, most of them probably followed the example of Coventry and Leicester and allowed the players special grants to cover their expenditure in providing quarters elsewhere.<sup>4</sup>

Our summary of the evidence concerning the size of the public gatherings, and the non-chargeable item of playing facilities brings us back to the question of the receipts from official fees at first performances. The town treasurers scrupulously record the amounts they expended for this purpose, and we are not compelled to seek our information in out-of-the-way places, as in the case of the unofficial but really much more important item of public gatherings. We have seen that the gifts of the city of Leicester, about 1590, ranged from 10s. to 40s. Naturally, as one surveys the whole of the provincial accounts, a much larger variation appears. The lowest payments on record are two of 4*d.* each—the rewards of the town of Gloucester to Sir Andrew Fortescue's Players in 1560, and of Plymouth to Lord Mounteagle's Men in 1575.<sup>5</sup> Other small fees, of 11*d.*, 2*s.*, 3*s.* 4*d.*, 5*s.*, and 6*s.* 8*d.*, are recorded,<sup>6</sup> but as a rule

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 235.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 395, 409.

<sup>3</sup> *The Mayor of Queenborough*, V, 1.

<sup>4</sup> See Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 254, and Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 226. It is interesting to note that the town-hall of Leicester was used for the presentation of plays until 1722, when a statutory prohibition put an end to the custom (Kelly, p. 273).

<sup>5</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 276–86, 383.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 200–205, 196, 197, 220, 256, 273. Murray, who collected much of this material, doubted the authenticity of an entry for the payment of 3*s.* to Lord Willoughby's Men at Coventry in 1612. He believed this sum too "niggardly" to be accurate, but the weight of his own evidence throws this view absolutely out of court. See Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 75.

these payments either came comparatively early in our period or went to companies of small repute. The great majority of the town rewards ranged from 10s. to 2l.<sup>1</sup> At the other end of the scale we find such towns as Newcastle-on-Tyne, Plymouth, Norwich, Worcester, and Coventry, occasionally granting the large<sup>2</sup> fees of 3l., 3l. 6s., and even 4l.<sup>3</sup> One of the Bristol entries indicates that this town on one occasion allowed a definite amount for each actor in the company which entertained the council. In the year 1581 the treasurer paid Lord Oxford's Men "being i man and ix boys at iis. a piece the sum of xxs.,"<sup>4</sup> but this rather blind method of fixing the reward of artistic endeavor does not appear elsewhere in the records. Both Collier and Kelly believed that the town rewards to the players were minutely graded according to the rank and prestige of their patrons.<sup>5</sup> Murray qualifies this view by noting that the records show no particular differentiation between the payments to companies patronized by the greater and the lesser nobles, but he follows Kelly to the extent of holding that "those companies patronized by royalty and one or two of the more famous noblemen always received the greatest amount."<sup>6</sup> This was generally but not "always" the case. I find, for example, that the reward of the King's Men at Coventry in November, 1627, was but 2s. 6d., whereas the same town fifty-two years earlier had paid Warwick's Men, an organization of much less prestige, the sum of 30s.<sup>7</sup> Again, the accounts of Smithills, Lancashire, for 1612 record a payment of 50s. to Lord Mounteagle's Players, the same company which had drawn but 4d. from Plymouth some years earlier.<sup>8</sup> Smithills, further, paid Strafford's Men 40s. in 1612, and but 3s. 4d. when they returned five years later, and Doncaster, which had granted Leicesters' Men 20s. for a performance in 1574, gave but 10s. to the King's

<sup>1</sup> See the records of Dover, Bristol, Doncaster, Worcester, York, or any of the towns, in Murray's collections, *E.D.C.*, II, and compare Kelly, Watts, and other collections of extracts from the town records.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 495, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 335, 358, 380, 412-13, 235.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 215.

<sup>5</sup> Collier, *Annals*, I, 84; Kelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-27.

<sup>6</sup> *Modern Philology*, II, 553.

<sup>7</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 235 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 220.

Men in 1633.<sup>1</sup> As a rule the companies under the patronage of the royal family or the great nobles fared best, but the evidence indicates that many of the towns practiced a refreshing eclecticism in apportioning their rewards—that on occasion at least they paid most liberally the companies whose acting pleased them most, irrespective of their patrons. The evidence indicates also that town fees increased gradually in the course of our period, and that in the ordinary course of events local prosperity or hard times were reflected in the rewards granted the players.

A word may be added concerning the gratuities often paid by the towns when for one reason or another they did not permit the players to "enact."<sup>2</sup> The amounts cover about the same range as the payments for official first performances. Thus "Lord Dakers his Players who did not playe" at Leicester in 1592 received 5s., "the King's Players who played not" drew 20s. there in 1621, and in the same year Queen Anne's Men were bought off with a gratuity of 30s.<sup>3</sup> The records of Leicester contain thirty-seven entries for the payment of similar gratuities, but the players were not always to be bought off. In 1585, for instance, Norwich refused Essex's Men permission to act "for fear of . . . infeccion," but "for their L. and Mr. his sake" allowed them a gratuity of 26s. 8d. The actors pocketed the money—and then calmly proceeded to play at the inn. The city fathers thereupon solemnly voted to withhold all future rewards from the culprits, only to prove a little later that they knew how to forgive and forget. Within four years the offending company received another reward of 20s. by order of the mayor.<sup>4</sup> Curiously enough, the gratuities paid "for sending them out of the city" were sometimes larger than the fees for the official performances. Barnstaple, for example, allowed the Prince's Men 40s. "for not playing" in 1621, and only 30s. for a town play the next year.<sup>5</sup> Certain of the poorer companies seem to have been quite content to pocket their gratuities and to go on their way rejoicing.

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 256.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 497.

<sup>3</sup> Kelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 226, 255.

<sup>4</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 336-37.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 199. See also II, 341-42, etc., for gratuities of 2l., 3l. 6s., etc.

The Norwich records of 1614 make mention of certain players who, "being demaunded wherefore their comeinge was, sayd they came not to ask leave to play But to aske the gratuetie of the Cytty."<sup>1</sup> Even substantial gratuities, however, could have offered but small compensation to the better companies for the loss of the takings of an extended stay. Indeed the records show that several companies absolutely refused to accept the gratuities offered them. Instead, on the strength of their licenses they defied the authorities and "enacted."<sup>2</sup>

Another matter deserves attention here—the number of performances the companies gave on an average visit,<sup>3</sup> and this involves the question of evening performances. Murray noted that the players sometimes gave their entertainment in the evening, but he believed that "their usual time of performance was in the afternoon, as in London."<sup>4</sup> The weight of the evidence indicates, however, not only that evening performances were the rule rather than the exception, but that the companies often played twice a day. Pembroke's Men at Norwich, for example, in the year 1598, got "lycens to use their facultie *two days and two nights* and not to use the same after nyne of the clock on either night." In 1610 this town allowed the Queen's Men to stay for one week on condition that they keep the Sabbath "nor [give] *more then one play a day*."<sup>5</sup> Again, the Plymouth records for 1618 testify that the Lady Elizabeth's Men "had the King's hand for playing *as well by night as by day*,"<sup>6</sup> and Richard Heton's draft for his patent as governor of the Queen's Men in 1635 provides for the same privilege. Heton stipulates that his company when in the country shall be free to perform "at all tyme or tymes (the tyme of Divine Service only excepted) *before or after supper*. . . ."<sup>7</sup> Many of the towns objected strongly to the

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 339.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 347, 356.

<sup>3</sup> Murray (*Modern Philology*, II, 555) states that he was unable to determine "how long a company would remain in a town" and "how many performances it would give . . . as the town records deal almost exclusively with the single performance in which the . . . authorities were financially interested." His later documents, and others, answer the question.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 551.

<sup>5</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 337-39.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 385.

<sup>7</sup> Cunningham, *Shakespeare Soc. Papers*, IV, 99.

disturbances which frequently accompanied evening performances. "Consideringe . . . the many disorders which by reason of plaies acted in the night time doe oftentime happen"—more particularly the rioting of apprentices—the town of Chester in 1615 felt obliged to forbid acting after six o'clock at night.<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that Canterbury, which in 1636 complained that its citizens were unable to "restrain their servants from being at the plays till near Midnight," some sixty years earlier had gone so far as to allow certain companies extra money to pay for "candellis & torches . . . at the play."<sup>2</sup> Such allowances were made from time to time also at Dover, Newcastle, and Bristol.<sup>3</sup> In short, it is clear that the custom of giving evening performances—or, in many cases, two a day—was very well established indeed.<sup>4</sup>

Some of our citations have touched not only upon the matter of double performances but also upon the length of the company's stay for any one visit. Considerable additional information on this point is available. We know, for example, that the companies occasionally played at great private houses for but one or two performances,<sup>5</sup> that the Norwich authorities in 1587 paid Leicester's Men 40s. on condition that "they play not above II times," and that the Queen's Men in 1600 successfully petitioned for leave to play there four days, whereas Huntington's Men and Hertford's were allowed three days each in the same town that year, the Lady Elizabeth's three days in 1617, and the Duke's Men eight days in 1614.<sup>6</sup> The 1618 patent of the Queen's Men authorized them to "play in any one place [not] above fourteen days together."<sup>7</sup> Twenty-three years earlier Canterbury had passed an ordinance which allowed but two performances to any one company, no company to visit the town more than once a month.<sup>8</sup> Restrictive measures of this sort sometimes caused trouble. When the Lady

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 235.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 275; II, 222, 227; cf. *Cal. State Papers*, 1636.

<sup>3</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 261, 335, 214.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. T. S. Graves, *Studies in Philology*, XIV, 103.

<sup>5</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 296.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 337-40, 344-45.

<sup>7</sup> Collier, *Annals*, I, 413, note.

<sup>8</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 233.

Elizabeth's Men came to Norwich in March, 1617, with the king's authority to play for fourteen days in any one town, the city fathers demurred, for this company had been in town earlier that year. They compromised by giving the players "one whole weke & no longer . . . . and they pmise . . . . not to come agayne during this whole yeare."<sup>1</sup> Our evidence warrants the conclusion that the average stay of the companies was three or four days, though occasional visits lasted for a week or even two weeks, and that many of the companies played twice on each day of their stay.

But one question remains to be dealt with. How many plays and companies did the provincial towns of England see in the course of a year? Once more the records may be permitted to speak for themselves. Bath paid for at least four town plays each year from 1577 to 1598—that is to say, its citizens probably had the opportunity to see fifteen or twenty plays a year during this period.<sup>2</sup> From 1590 to the close of Queen Elizabeth's reign in 1603 Leicester was visited by four, five, or even six companies each season, and an average of four companies came during the reign of King James.<sup>3</sup> Coventry paid for 304 official first performances between 1574 and 1642, distributing its largesse to some five different companies each year, with not a single year missing. And Stratford-on-Avon in 1587, about the time of Shakspeare's arrival in London, was entertained by four different companies.<sup>4</sup> The list might be extended indefinitely. No additional figures or illustrations are needed, however, to show how great a hold the drama had upon the provinces, nor to drive home the fact that from them the players and their playwrights derived a very substantial part of the support that enabled them to live in their own day, and so, in the last analysis, for all time.

ALWIN THALER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 345.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 200 ff. The calculations and summaries are my own.

<sup>3</sup> See Kelly, *op. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> Murray, *E.D.C.*, II, 235, 402.

THE EARLY POPULARITY OF MILTON'S MINOR  
POEMS—*Concluded*

---

III

There is hardly room here for a discussion of the theories of imitation prevalent in the years 1645-1740.<sup>1</sup> Luckily the large facts of the case are generally known. In the earlier part of this period imitation of classical *genres* was the duty of every poet. Such imitation produced "Paradise Lost," "Samson Agonistes," and dozens of lesser creations in the several approved "kinds." Meanwhile, there was relatively little attention to types struck out by modern or English poets. Such writers were mainly utilized as storehouses of excellent phrases, and their diction was frequently echoed by their successors. Hence the value of the phrasal digests made by such men as Poole, Bysshe, and Gildon. Borrowing phrases was not necessarily a covert proceeding, as Thomas Warton seems to have thought (*op. cit.*, pp. x, xi), though it was apparently more creditable to borrow from the ancients than from the moderns. The poet, if successful, made some new or clever application of the phrase borrowed, whereupon he was frequently content to advertise the fact by printing the source in a footnote, or by printing the borrowed phrase in italics. Early in the eighteenth century occasional quotation marks indicate borrowings, but this present-day method was then rare. In most of his poems, for example, Pope called attention to his classical borrowings—and decidedly less often to his English borrowings—in footnotes. Not late in the century the hold of the classical "kinds" on poets began to weaken, and imitations of various English and French poets became more frequent. The numberless imitations of Milton's minor poems, or, to be more exact, of "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" around 1750 do not necessarily imply a sudden awakening to the merits of these poems; the fact is merely that, Horace's *Satires* and Ovid's *Heroides*

<sup>1</sup> A very interesting comment on some phases of imitation may be found in the University of North Carolina *Studies in Philology*, XV, 195-206: "Imitation of Spenser and Milton in the early Eighteenth Century: a new Document," by R. S. Crane.

having had their day, poets moved on to Boileau, Fontenelle, La Fontaine, Spenser, Cowley, Butler, and Milton.

The early imitations of the minor poems here to be cited consist mainly of phrasal echoes. In fact, it is difficult to distinguish structural imitation of most of the poems, because they themselves follow well-established types. One cannot tell surely whether a pastoral elegy follows "Lycidas," Theocritus, Bion, Virgil, Sannazaro, or Spenser. Imitations of "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," and "Comus" are perhaps easiest to detect, a fact which may explain in part why more of them have been noted. Someone may observe that the parallels here noted are mainly later than 1700. It is true that the poetry read from the seventeenth century has yielded slight return, whereas the early eighteenth-century parallels seem inexhaustible.<sup>1</sup>

Organization of the citations again is a problem. Since the passages from Milton are not to be printed, it seems wise to arrange the parallels in the order of the passages which they recall. This method, of course, is faulty because not infrequently two different Milton poems—sometimes three—are reflected in one passage.

A rough chronological summary may be given. From the seventeenth century there are parallels in the poems of at least eight different authors. The first decade of the eighteenth century has furnished about two dozen parallels from about twelve different sources; the second decade, thirty-five from twenty-four sources; the third, sixty-five from over thirty sources; the fourth, over thirty from less than twenty sources. There would be a total of about fifty different men, of all descriptions, echoing the minor poems in this period. Some poems cited are anonymous, and may be by the same author: this invalidates any rigidly exact summary in figures.

It may be useful also to mention together the individual poets of the period who were most notable borrowers from these poems. The earliest and most glaring case—in which borrowing becomes rank plagiarism—is the *Cyprian Academy* of Robert Baron (1647).

<sup>1</sup> Professor C. A. Moore in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIV, 278-81, has just pointed out interesting influences of the minor poems on W. Hinchliffe's "Seasons" (1718), which I have not seen. Hinchliffe justly seems an important link in the tradition leading from Milton to Thomson.

Thomas Warton (pp. 403-7) has cited sufficiently numerous parallels from this curious work. Baron drew perhaps most frequently from the "Comus," but he slighted nothing, using even the sonnets and the Marchioness of Winchester poem. The plagiarism was condemned; for in his *Pocula Castalia* (1650) in an Epigram to Momus (p. 124) Baron says:

My Book, like *Persius*, 'gainst the wall he hurries  
Saying, *Dicitque tibi tua Pagina fur es.*

Another type of indebtedness is seen in the mid-century work of Andrew Marvell, who in his poem "Upon Appleton House" seems influenced by the structure of the two poems "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso." Grosart in his edition of Marvell points out that line 610 of this poem has the phrase "gadding vines" from "Lycidas," line 40. I have seen no other close verbal parallels.

In the earlier eighteenth century Pope is doubtless the most illustrious borrower of phrases from the minor poems, and Thomson is the most illustrious borrower of mood and detail. Others whose work was colored by the poems are John Hughes, whose "Calypso and Telemachus" is reminiscent of "Comus" in plot; Parnell, who has many pieces tinged with "Il Penseroso"; Moses Browne, whose "Piscatory Eclogues" (1727, 1739) are full of echoes; David Mallet, who blends Thomson with Milton; and William Hamilton, some of whose poems written before 1740 are very close to "Il Penseroso." Hamilton must have had an auditory rather than a visual memory for this poem, for in "Contemplation" he seems to have translated "black, staid Wisdom's hue" ("Il Penseroso," l. 16) into "Wisdom's black-stay'd train." This version is an extreme specimen of the "hash" poets made of these popular poems.

#### A. "L'ALLEGRO"

It is difficult to separate "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso," especially when it comes to substantial imitations. Gay, for instance, in his "Rural Sports" (1713), Canto I, follows "L'Allegro" (ll. 41-90) in lines 31-52, and then shifting, follows "Il Penseroso" (ll. 131-50; 51-76) in lines 53-90 and 105-14. Dyer in 1726 published "Grongar Hill" and "The Country Walk," which in a manner

are companion pieces after the model of these two Milton poems.<sup>1</sup> In "An Epistle from a Gentleman to his Friend in the Country" (in the *Bee* for April 26, 1733 [I, 542-43]) the emphasis is rather on "Il Penseroso" and the night details, but the resemblance is real. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, April, 1735 (V, 215), has a poem in the vein of "L'Allegro" written "To Sylvan Urban" recounting the pleasures of a day in the country. After noting these general, structural imitations, we may pass to consideration of imitations of specific passages of "L'Allegro."

Since the *procul este* and the invocation of the start seem very popular, two or three imitations of them need quotation. Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe in an early poem "To Mrs. Arabella Marrow, in the Country" writes (ll. 21 ff.):

Hence ye gilded toys of state,  
Ye formal follies of the great,  
Nor e'er disturb this peaceful seat;

and in Amintor's poem "On our Saviour's Nativity" in her *Letters moral and entertaining* (Letter XII, dated 1733) we read:

Fly, rigid Winter, with thy horid face.  
And let the soft and lovely Spring take place;  
Oh! come thou fairest season of the year,  
With garlands deck'd and verdant robes appear.

John Hughes (d. 1720) in a paraphrase of Horace's "Integer vitae" went out of his way to write:<sup>2</sup>

Hence slavish Fear! thy *Stygian* Wings display!  
Thou ugly Fiend of Hell, away!  
Wrapp'd in thick Clouds, and Shades of Night,  
To conscious Souls direct thy Flight!  
There brood on Guilt, fix there a loath'd Embrace,  
And propagate vain Terrors, Frights,  
Dreams, Goblins, and imagin'd Sprights,  
Thy visionary Tribe. . . .

<sup>1</sup> For Dyer's indebtedness to Milton see an article in the *Journal of English and German Philology*, XVI, 274-81, by Professor Garland Greever. In general, I save space by not citing persons who have pointed out parallels that I use. I am willing to disclaim any credit there may be in finding the parallels that are exclusively my own, if there be any credit; for I have no interest in the parallels as such—merely as proof that the poems paralleled were known and liked. It is only just, however, to mention with thanks the many editors of Pope, from Newton down; the edition of the "Seasons" by Zippel; G. C. Macaulay's *Life of Thomson*; Professor J. E. Wells's additions to Macaulay's lists of parallels (see *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIV, 60-61); and Mary Stuart Leather's article on "Pope as a Student of Milton" in *Eng. Stud.*, XXV, 400 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Poems* (1735), I, 113.

Among briefer phrasal echoes of the opening passage may be noted the "Stygian caves" found in Thomson's "Upon Happiness" (l. 90); and the "low-brow'd rocks" of Pope's "Eloisa" (l. 244). A palpable copying of Milton's parentage of "heart-easing Mirth" (l. 13) appears in John Philips' "Cyder" (1708; Chalmers, VIII, 393-94):

Now solemn Rites he pays  
To *Bacchus*, Author of Heart-cheering Mirth.

The invitation of "L'Allegro" (ll. 25-40) was also frequently imitated. Lines 25 and 26 are echoed in "The Happy Lover's Invocation to Night" (*Gent. Mag.*, III, 487):

Night! to lovers joys a friend,  
Haste, and thy assistance lend;  
Hasten, goddess, lock up day,  
Bring the willing Nymph away . . . .

Isaac Hawkins Brown, avowedly imitating Swift, writes in Imitation VI of his "Pipe of Tobacco" (*Gent. Mag.*, VI, 105):

Come jovial pipe, and bring along  
Midnight revelry and song.

Dr. Hoadly's "Verses under the Prints of Mr. Hogarth's Rake's Progress" (1735) used the minor poems for matter, and hence the lines under plate II may be quoted, though not especially close to "L'Allegro":

PLEASURE, in her silver throne,  
Smiling comes, nor comes alone;  
*Venus* comes with her along,  
And smooth *Lyaeus* ever young;  
And in their train, to fill the press,  
Come apish *Dance*, and swoll'n *Excess*,  
*Mechanic Honour*, vicious *Taste*,  
And *Fashion* in her changing vest.

Philips' "Cyder" lists some figures familiar in the train of Mirth (Chalmers, VIII, 389):

Heav'n's sweetest Blessing, hail!  
Be thou the copious Matter of my Song  
And thy choice *Nectar*; on which always waits  
Laughter, and Sport, and care-beguiling Wit . . . .

Parnell (d. 1718) had absorbed the minor poems before writing his eclogue "Health" (see Chalmers, IX, 361):

Come, country goddess, come; nor thou suffice,  
But bring thy mountain-sister, Exercise.

Oh come, thou goddess of my rural song,  
And bring thy daughter, calm Content along,  
Dame of the ruddy cheek and laughing eye,  
From whose bright presence clouds of sorrow fly . . . .

Now to grave books I bid the mind retreat . . . .

Green's "Grotto" in Dodsley's *Collection*, V, 162-63, exclaims:<sup>1</sup>

Let not profane this sacred place,  
Hypocrisy with Janus' face;

Or frolic Mirth profanely loud,  
And happy only in a crowd;  
Or Melancholy's pensive gloom,  
Proxy in Contemplation's room.

William Hamilton in his "Contemplation" (written 1739) addresses Devotion, saying:

Sure thine to put to flight the boy  
Of laughter, sport, and idle joy.

The landscape details of early morning are dangerously conventional, but either because of obvious resemblance or of Miltonic details in the context the following parallels seem quotable:

Before the yellow barn I see  
A beautiful variety  
Of strutting cocks, advancing stout.

[Dyer's "Country Walk," ll. 9-11. Cf. L'A., ll. 51-52.]

Here let me frequent roam, preventing morn,  
Attentive to the cock, whose early throat,  
Heard from the distant village in the vale,  
Crows cheerly out, far-sounding through the gloom.

[Mallet's "Excursion" (1726) in Chalmers, XIV, 17. Cf. L'A., l. 54, etc.]

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also "Il Penseroso," l. 54. Green's poem is advertised in Dodsley as "printed in the Year 1732, but never published."

Hygeia's sons with hound and horn,  
And jovial cry awake the Morn.

[Green's "Spleen" (1737),<sup>1</sup> ll. 73-74. Cf. L'A.,  
ll. 53-54.]

This part of "L'Allegro" is, as Professor J. E. Wells has indicated,<sup>2</sup> reflected in the details of Thomson's "Morning in the Country," especially in line 2, where

The morning springs in thousand liveries drest.

Moses Browne's "Piscatory Eclogues" (1st ed., 1727), as quoted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, VIII (1738), 432, show the conventional whistling ploughboy in a Miltonic manner:

The plow-boy, o'er the furrows whistles blith,  
And in the mead the mower whets his syth.

And possibly John Philips' "Cyder" should also be quoted:

. . . . . this the Peasants blith  
Will quaff, and whistle, as thy tinkling Team  
They drive.

Milton's "russet lawns" and high embosoming trees (L'A., ll. 71, 78) are appealing; witness Pope's "Windsor Forest," ll. 23 and 27, Thomson's "Winter" (1726 version), l. 74, and a poem called "Stoke's Bay" in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX (1739), 263-64, which has:

Here the tall grove surrounds the rural seat,  
There russet downs the distant view compleat.

Thomson's "Autumn" has also a "russet mead" (l. 971) suitable for solitary and pensive wandering. Milton allows "the nibbling flock" to "stray" here (l. 72); Thomson lets his "nibbling flock stray o'er the rising hills" in line 13 of "On Beauty," a poem full of echoes of this passage of "L'Allegro" and of "Il Penseroso," ll. 56-59. Thomson's "Spring," l. 954, has "villages embosom'd soft in trees."

Passing to the country sports, we find Gay ("Rural Sports," Canto I, ll. 31, 32) echoing "L'Allegro" (ll. 91, 92) in rhyme at least when he exclaims:

'Tis not that rural sports alone invite  
But all the grateful country breathes delight.

<sup>1</sup> The rural images of this poem, especially in ll. 630-87, have at least general resemblance to "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso."

<sup>2</sup> *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIV, 60.

The "chequer'd shade" (L'A., l. 96) appealed to Pope ("Lines to Gay," l. 7) and Dyer ("Grongar Hill," l. 27); and Pope also liked the later pleasures of the "spicy nutbrown bowl" ("Wife of Bath's Prologue," l. 214; cf. L'A., l. 100). Milton's passage on the superstitious tales told at night (ll. 101-16) found appreciative reflection in Thomson's "Autumn," ll. 1145-56 and "Winter," ll. 617-20.

The transition to the city was early used by Andrew Marvell, who in "The Garden" (ll. 11, 12), speaking to Quiet and Innocence, says:

Mistaken long, I sought you then  
In busy companies of men.

The city pleasures have fewer echoes than those of the country. Thomson has a poetically "haunted stream" in "Summer," ll. 11, 12 (L'A., l. 130), but for the rest I have noted only parallels—some doubtful—to the Shakespeare passage (L'A., ll. 131-34):

Whether in masks he pleas'd the town;  
The buskin or the sock put on . . . .

["Epitaph for the Late Lord Lansdown" in *Gent. Mag.*,  
VII, 508 (August, 1737).]

Is not wild Shakespeare thine and nature's boast?  
[Thomson's "Summer," l. 1566.]

And while by Art your charming Numbers move,  
Her *Wood-wild* Notes instruct her to improve  
[Nahum Tate, "To the Athenian Society."]<sup>1</sup>

Warble the birds, exulting on the wing,  
And all the wood-wild notes the genial blessings sing  
[Wm. Thompson, "The Nativity" (1736); see Chalmers,  
XV, 19.]

A final parallel—to line 137—may be added from the prose of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (VII, 195), where the writer says: "Milton elegantly expressed it, *Music was married to Poetry*." We have here in all something like forty-four parallels from about twenty-five authors, in poems all dating before 1740.

#### B. "IL PENSEROSO"

The mood of "Il Penseroso" was so thoroughly in tune with the mood of the many poems on retirement, night, etc., produced in

<sup>1</sup> This poem was prefixed to Gildon's *History of the Athenian Society* (1692) and reprinted by Dunton in his *Life and Errors* (1705), p. 259. "Her" refers to Tate's Muse.

this period, that it would be strange indeed if Milton's poem did not find imitators. Among the poems of a melancholy cast that seem to have a general indebtedness to "Il Penseroso" may be listed the following: John Hughes's "Thought in a Garden" (1704); "Pre-existence: A Poem in Imitation of Milton,"<sup>1</sup> published first in 1714 with a preface by J. B., and reprinted in Dodsley's *Collection* (1766), I, 158-72, (see especially p. 166); Parnell's "Night Piece on Death," "Hymn to Contentment," and "Hermit"; James Ralph's "Night" (1728); Thomson's *Seasons* in various passages;<sup>2</sup> and perhaps Mallet's "Excursion" (1728), his "Hermit," and his "Funeral Hymn"; a poem in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, IX (1739), 599 beginning "Hail Melancholy! gloomy power"; and lastly the early work of William Hamilton, to be quoted presently.

We may most conveniently follow through the parallels to "Il Penseroso" as we did those to "L'Allegro." The first lines indeed were largely treated with the opening of "L'Allegro," but we may add Broome's lines from his ode "Melancholy" (1723):

Adieu, vain mirth, and noisy joys!  
Ye gay desires, deluding toys!  
Thou, thoughtful Melancholy, deign  
To hide me in thy pensive train!

The invitation to Melancholy (ll. 31 ff.) found almost endless imitation. Hamilton, in his poem "To the Countess of Eglintoun"<sup>3</sup> (1726), even applies to Happiness the sedate Miltonic adjectives:

Nun sober and devout! why art thou fled  
To hide in shades thy meek contented head?  
Virgin of aspect mild! ah why unkind,  
Fly'st thou displeas'd, the commerce of mankind?  
O! teach our steps to find the secret cell  
Where with thy sire Content thou lov'st to dwell.

Similarly in "Contemplation" (written 1739) after Faith and Hope have been invited, he proceeds in Miltonic fashion:

And bring the meek-ey'd Charity,<sup>4</sup>  
Not least, though youngest of the three:

<sup>1</sup> See *Notes and Queries* for Jan. 5, 1907 (10 ser., VII, 4).

<sup>2</sup> See the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, X, 108; Zippel remarks a resemblance in the first form of "Winter," ll. 33-300, to Milton's poem from l. 45 on; Professor Wells has thought "Spring," ll. 1024-47, worth citing; and there are other passages.

<sup>3</sup> Hamilton's poems are quoted from Chalmers, Vol. XV.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. "meek-ey'd Peace" in the "Nativity Hymn," l. 46.

With Silence, sober-suited maid,  
 Seldom on this earth survey'd:  
 Bid in this sacred band appear,  
 That aged venerable seer,  
 With sorrowing pale, with watchings spare,  
 Of pleasing yet dejected air,  
 Him, heavenly Melancholy hight,  
 Who flies the sons of false delight,

Last to crown all, with these be join'd  
 The decent nun, fair Peace of Mind,  
 Whom innocence, ere yet betray'd,  
 Bore in Eden's happy shade.

Hamilton continues presently with an address to Devotion quite in this same strain. In this one poem he has echoes not only of "Il Penseroso" but of "L'Allegro," "Lycidas," and the "Nativity Hymn." Thomson likewise goes to Milton when he wishes to summon his Amanda:<sup>1</sup>

Come with those downcast eyes, sedate and sweet,  
 Those looks demure that deeply pierce the soul.

Milton would doubtless prefer to think the following address to Delia (Queen Caroline?) from Green's "Grotto" as "without father bred," but it seems Miltonic—though it is Milton sadly debased:

Come Nymph with rural honors drest,  
 Virtue's exterior form confest,  
 With charms untarnished, innocence  
 Display, and Eden shall commence:  
 When thus you come in sober fit,  
 And wisdom is prefer'd to wit;  
 And looks diviner graces tell,  
 Which don't with giggling muscles dwell.

The use of the somber details (ll. 34, 35) of Milton's invitation passage with intentionally gloomy effect is perhaps best seen in a passage in Parnell's "Night Piece on Death":

Why then thy flowing sable stoles,  
 Deep pendent cypress, mourning poles,  
 Loose scarfs to fall athwart thy weeds,  
 Long palls, drawn hearses, cover'd steeds,  
 And plumes of black, that, as they tread,  
 Nod o'er the escutcheons of the dead?

<sup>1</sup> "Spring," ll. 485-86. Cf. also "L'Allegro," l. 138.

Mallet in his "Excursion" presents Night in a pensive fashion less gloomy:

Onward she comes with silent step and slow,  
In her brown mantle wrapt, and brings along  
The still, the mild, the melancholy hour,  
And Meditation, with his eye on Heaven.

Mallet here has made especial use of lines 38 and 39. Parallels to line 42 are strangely few; at least the only one I have seen is in Pope's "Eloisa" (l. 24):

I have not yet forgot myself to stone.

In "Grongar Hill" (l. 115) similarly is the only use noted of the "trim gardens" of line 50.

"The cherub Contemplation" as conceived by Milton in his poem (l. 54) and in "Comus" (l. 377) was thought by Newton to be new and less satisfactory than Spenser's figure of venerable age.<sup>1</sup> Both conceptions are met with in our period. Hamilton in his poem "Contemplation" gives a Miltonic treatment; Green ("The Grotto," l. 166) places Contemplation with other figures from "Il Penseroso"; and perhaps two lines from Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe's *Letters moral and entertaining* (1729) reflect Milton:

Upon its banks you, undisturb'd may ly,  
While Contemplation wafts you to the sky.<sup>2</sup>

Passages concerning Philomela and the moon are usually too conventional to be associated specifically with Milton's famous lines 56-72. The moon affords more and better parallels, two of which are worth quoting:

Now stooping, seems to kiss the passing cloud:  
Now, o'er the pure *Cerulean*, rides sublime  
[Thomson's "Winter" (1726 version), ll. 91, 92; cf.  
"Il Penseroso," ll. 67-68, 71-72, and "Comus,"  
ll. 331-33].

Now while Phoebus *riding high*  
[Dyer's "Grongar Hill," l. 11].

The sound of Milton's curfew (l. 76) had at least one astonishing echo. The *Grub-street Journal* for February 5, 1730, in distinguishing

<sup>1</sup> See Newton's ed. of Milton's *Works*, III, 372, note on "Il Penseroso," l. 52; and compare "Faerie Queene," I, Canto X, ll. 46-48, for the figure "of a venerable old man." In his "Hymn to Heavenly Beauty," ll. 133-36, Spenser seems to me to furnish sufficient source for a soaring Contemplation.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from her *Works* (1796), I, 172.

between "the Parnassian and the Grubean fashions" of imitating Milton, cites as example of the latter, John Dennis' "Poem on the battle of Blenheim." Dennis writes thus of the Danube:

. . . . thy brown billows sounding on the shore  
And swinging slow with hoarse and sullen roar,  
Kept murmuring comfort to thy threat'ning moan.

James Ralph's "Night" is also criticized in the *Journal* essay. It is interesting to see any periodical in 1730 assuming that imitation of Milton—minor poems included—is prevalent, and attempting to set bounds to the mode.

The night scene indoors is easily conventionalized, but at least two similar passages seem influenced by Milton (ll. 79 ff.). John Philips in "Cyder" (Chalmers, VIII, 388) writes:

. . . . lo! thoughtful of Thy Gain,  
Not of my Own, I all the live-long Day  
Consume in Meditation deep, recluse  
From human Converse, nor, at shut of Eve,  
Enjoy Repose; but oft at Midnight Lamp  
Ply my brain-racking Studies . . . .

Certainly the mood, probably the "midnight lamp" also, comes from "Il Penseroso" (cf. l. 85). But the most famous imitation is found in the 1726 version of "Winter," lines 256-58:

A rural, shelter'd, solitary, Scene;  
Where ruddy Fire, and beaming Tapers join  
To chase the cheerless gloom: there let me sit  
And hold high Converse with the mighty Dead.

The outdoor details of the following day are more often copied, especially the "twilight groves" (l. 133), which fitted the very popular theme of retirement. The earlier details of morning are sometimes used; at least a faint echo of Milton's lines (128-29) on the morning breeze is to be found in Pope's "Winter," line 80:

. . . . when the whisp'ring breeze,  
Pants on the leaves, and dies upon the trees.

Pope's "Eloisa" (l. 163) borrows the "twilight groves," as do the following lines from Thomson's "Autumn" (ll. 1030-31), which also embody an echo of "L'Allegro," line 78:

Oh! bear me then to vast embowering shades,  
To twilight groves, and visionary vales.

The ease with which shade and retirement are associated is apparent in Broome's "Poem on the Seat of the War in Flanders, chiefly with relation to the sieges: with the praise of peace and retirement. Written in 1710," where Broome entreats:

Come, thou chaste maid, here let me stray  
While the calm hours steal unperceived away;  
Here court the Muses, while the Sun on high  
Flames in the vault of Heaven, and fires the sky:  
Or while the night's dark wings this globe surround,  
And the pale Moon begins her solemn round.

And in the morning he reads old books "reclin'd" in silence "on a mossy bed." The latter half of an undated "Fragment" by Mallet<sup>1</sup> shows alike the influence of this noon-time passage and of similar passages in "L'Allegro" and the *Seasons*. The bee, which Milton artfully (ll. 142-43) and Mallet casually introduce, was made more consciously a part of a similar scene in Canto I, lines 83-86 of Gay's "Rural Sports":

The careful insect 'midst his works I view,  
Now from the flowers exhaust the fragrant dew;  
With golden treasures load his little thighs,  
And steer his distant journey through the skies.

Thomson ("Summer," ll. 627-28) seems to have an eye on Gay as well as on Milton, for his bee

Strays diligent, and with the extracted balm  
Of fragrant woodbine loads his little thigh.

Todd, in his note to line 152,<sup>2</sup> cites a highly interesting passage from the first version of Thomson's "Summer":

And, frequent, in the middle watch of night,  
Or, all day long, in desarts still, are heard,  
Now here, now there, now wheeling in mid sky,  
Around, or underneath, aerial sounds,  
Sent from angelick harps, and voices join'd;  
A happiness bestow'd by us alone,  
On Contemplation, or the hallow'd ear  
Of poet, swelling to seraphick strain.

The scene within the church (ll. 155-66) made notable appeal to Pope and Addison. The "storied halls" of the "Essay on Man,"

<sup>1</sup> Chalmers, XIV, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Milton's *Poetical Works* (1800), VI, 135, note.

Epistle IV, line 303, is thought a reminiscence of Milton's "storied windows." Certainly in "Eloisa" (ll. 143-44) Pope succeeds in producing the romantic thrill of Milton's church:

Where awful arches make a noon-day night,  
And the dim windows shed a solemn light;

as he does also in line 353:

From the full choir, when loud Hosannas rise.

Addison conveniently adopted some of Milton's organ details into his "Ode for St. Cecilia's Day" (1699):

Next, let the solemn organ join  
Religious airs, and strains divine,  
Such as may lift us to the skies,  
And set all Heaven before our eyes.

It is possible also that John Pomfret, at some time about the same date, had line 165 in his mind when he wrote, in "Love Triumphant over Reason" (Chalmers, VIII, 313):

My ravish'd soul, with secret wonder fraught,  
Lay all dissolv'd in ecstasy of thought.

The figurative use of "dissolve," however, seems generally popular with both Milton and Pomfret.

From the ending of the poem we have the phrase "mossy cell" imitated in Dyer's "Grongar Hill" (l. 15) and doubtless many other poems. Pope's "Summer" (l. 32) palpably adapts line 172 of "Il Penseroso" into:

And ev'ry plant that drinks the morning dew.

It is well known that John Hughes thought the ending might be improved by adding eight rather moral lines of his own composition. They may be read in Chalmers, X, 55.

Even if we had no other evidence, it seems to the writer that the preceding parallels prove sufficiently that English poets had, before 1740, thoroughly masticated—rather than mastered—the idiom of "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso."

#### C. "COMUS"

Imitations of the *genre* of "Comus" are naturally not numerous, for the masque was a declining type before the eighteenth century. Nevertheless one may note in Baron's *Cyprian Academy* (1648)

two works, "Bona Deorum" and "Gripus and Hegio," which are indebted to Milton's poem. In 1712 John Hughes brought out an opera called *Calypso and Telemachus*, which is obviously reminiscent of "Comus" in plot. The designs of *Calypso* are sufficiently indicated in the words of Mentor to Telemachus:

She still deludes thee.  
Th' alluring cup she lately gave  
Was filled with noxious Juice  
T' inslave thy Reason's nobler Pow'rs.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Good (p. 35, note) also lists "Sabrina, a Masque . . . Founded on the Comus of Milton" as printed in 1737. It was by Rolli, and was intended as operatic material. Finally, in 1738, "Comus" was reworked by the Rev. John Dalton and with music by Dr. Arne was successfully staged.<sup>2</sup> Dalton's adaptation was for a time frequently reprinted; it doubtless did serve to increase interest in Milton's poem and perhaps in all the minor poems, but evidently such interest existed already.

Further general influence of the poem is slightly visible in such pieces as "A Poem on Chastity. . . . By Pastorus" printed in the *Post-Angel* (III, 152) for March, 1702, and in Ralph's "Night" (1728; see p. 50), where the poet remarks:

Sometimes the guardian pow'rs of virtue's sons,  
Array'd in all the glories of the sky,  
Descend indulgent to their earthly charge,  
And drive the horrors of the night away;  
Tune to immortal songs their golden lyres,  
And sooth the woes of life with heav'n's eternal joys.<sup>3</sup>

There is a somewhat similar passage—less close to the idea of "Comus"—in Thomson's "Summer," lines 525-30.

It is interesting, and of course dangerous, to speculate how far the various uses of the proper names "Comus" and "Sabrina" in later poems may be due to the "Mask."<sup>4</sup> Both occur before Milton; but "Comus" occurred in rather inconspicuous places. Sabrina's story is told by Spenser, whose predecessors, in turn, seem to reach

<sup>1</sup> From Hughes's *Poems* (1735), II, 55.

<sup>2</sup> On this matter see *Gent. Mag.*, VIII, 151-52, or the *Universal Spectator*, No. 454 (March 25, 1738).

<sup>3</sup> An excellent parallel to l. 86 comes to light as this goes to press. See Thomas Killigrew's "Claracilla" (1664), p. 5 (Act I, Scene 3).

<sup>4</sup> See Todd's ed. of the *Poetical Works*, VI, 247-49, note.

back as far as Geoffrey of Monmouth. But Rolli in retelling her tale avows the stimulus of Milton; and quite possibly John Philips, an ardent disciple, may have been influenced by "Comus" to devote two lines to the "nais" in his "Cerealia" (1708). Moses Browne's seventh "Piscatory Eclogue" (1727, 1739) also is certainly to be mentioned; for in it Comus, a decent sort of rustic, sings in a song contest the story of Sabrina—much in the manner of Spenser's pastorals, but with Miltonic echoes, as when he ends:

Sabrina, cease thy list'ning flood to bring,  
And Echo, cease, and let me cease to sing.

Usually the mentions of Comus as a rustic or supernatural being are more definitely "in character," implying at least joviality. Such mentions may be found in *Spectator*, No. 425; in an "Anacreontic" by Parnell; in Congreve's "Mourning Muse of Alexis"; and lastly in Mallet's "Cupid and Hymen"—which may date after 1740. An interesting modification of the name is probably to be seen in a pastoral elegy signed "Comerus," which has faint echoes of "Il Penseroso" and "Lycidas." In the elegy Comerus is a typical shepherd, not the jovial or supernatural personage of Milton.<sup>1</sup>

The phrasal echoes of "Comus" are numerous, though not more plentiful than those of the two poems already considered. These echoes distribute themselves over the whole poem evenly—with perhaps some emphasis on the lyric portions.

There are notable parallels to the opening speech of the Attendant Spirit. From line 6 Pope took "low-thoughted care" for "Eloisa to Abelard," line 298; and Thomson in "Autumn," line 967, has "low-thoughted vice" in a passage otherwise colored by the minor poems. Pope, who curiously enough borrowed more from "Comus" than from any of the other minor poems, "lifted" line 14 for use in his "Epilogue to the Satires" (Satire II, l. 235):

And opes the temple of eternity.

Dr. Hoadly similarly borrowed entire from line 47 one of his verses placed under the third print in Hogarth's "Rake's Progress" (1735):

Sweet Poison of misused WINE.

<sup>1</sup> The poem was printed in *Mist's Weekly-Journal* for Sept. 10, 1720 (No. 93; p. 554), and reprinted in the 1722 *Collection of Letters from Mist's Weekly-Journal*, I, 309-10.

Line 53 was probably in Pope's mind when in his "Satires of Dr. Donne Versified" (Satire IV, ll. 166-67) he wrote:

Not more amazement seized on Circe's guests,  
To see themselves fall endlong into beasts.

The same poet, so Elwin pointed out,<sup>1</sup> probably changed his first writing of "Windsor Forest," line 385, because it too closely resembled the bold lines of "Comus," 94-96. The tone of Milton's lines 102-6 is much like that of the conventional "Anacreontic" of his century; but in at least one of Cowley's "Anacreontics" (1656), as Godwin<sup>2</sup> points out, there is unusually close resemblance to Milton, lines 105-6. Cowley's lines are:

Fill the bowl with rosie wine,  
Around our temples roses twine.

It is further noticeable that Pope's dancers in "January and May," line 353, "beat the ground" as do those of "Comus," line 143. Perhaps the romantic thrill of Comus' "dazzling spells" is most truly caught by Moses Browne in his fifth eclogue, which ostensibly imitates "Lycidas":

Mean time to the merk gloom trip fast along  
The wood-nymph bevy and swart fairy bands,  
And the elf-urchin throng,  
With each drear shape that lives in mildew blight,  
And ev'ry blue fog of the spongy air,  
Oft do I view 'em from the hilly lands  
Ere the fled Cock rings his shrill matin clear,  
Or toiling hind loath leaves his dawn-woke dream . . . .<sup>3</sup>

The scene between Comus and the Lady offers some parallels, which are, however, of but slight value. Thomson's "Winter," lines 297-99, may be compared with lines 205-9 of "Comus." There are doubtfully significant resemblances between Pope's "Winter" (l. 41) and line 230; and between his *Odyssey*, Book XIII, line 57, and line 262 of "Comus." More striking is Pope's indebtedness to lines 290-91 for lines 61-62 of his "Autumn":

While lab'ring oxen, spent with toil and heat,  
In their loose traces from the field retreat.

<sup>1</sup> Pope's *Works*, I, 364, note.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 287-88.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. with this passage "Comus," ll. 154, 430, and "L'Allegro," l. 114. The meter may be referred to "Lycidas."

Echoes from the conversation between the brothers and from their scene with the supposed Thyrsis group themselves about two or three passages. The first of these deals with Contemplation (ll. 377 ff.), and is to be related to the similar figure in "Il Penseroso," lines 51-54. Some uses of this figure by Milton's successors have been given; two or three more are worth giving in connection with the "Comus" passage:

Delightful Mansion! Blest Retreat!  
Where all is silent, all is sweet!  
Here Contemplation prunes her Wings,  
The raptur'd Muse more tuneful Sings,  
While May leads on the Cheerful Hours,<sup>1</sup>  
And opens a New World of Flowers

[John Hughes, "A Thought in a Garden" (*Poems*, I, 171)].

Nature in ev'ry object points the road,  
Whence contemplation wings my soul to God

[Mrs. Mary Chandler (ca. 1736?); quoted from T. Cibber's *Lives of the Poets*, V, 347].

Bear me, some God! oh quickly bear me hence  
To wholesome Solitude, the nurse of sense:  
Where Contemplation prunes her ruffled wings  
And the free soul looks down to pity Kings!

[Pope, "Satires of Dr. Donne," Satire IV, ll. 184 ff.].

Another popular line from this section of the poem is 429, which was used, slightly changed, by Pope in "Eloisa" (l. 20), and by Thomson in "Spring" (ll. 909-10). Lines 494-95 also caught the attention of readers: witness Pope's "Summer," lines 5-6; his "Winter," lines 57-58; and Moses Browne's eclogue "The Sea Swains":

He, wond'rous artist, with his magic lay,  
Could the steam's rapid tide encaptiv'd stay.

A striking parallel to line 549 is seen in Thomson's "Summer," lines 947-50:

At Evening, to the setting Sun he turns  
A mournful Eye, and down his dying heart  
Sinks helpless; while the wonted Roar is up,  
And Hiss continual thro' the tedious Night.

<sup>1</sup> See also Milton's "Sonnet to the Nightingale," l. 4.

The lyrics surrounding the appearance of Sabrina were justly among the most popular parts of the poem. Ambrose Philips in his second "Pastoral" (ll. 65-66) perhaps chose his adjectives from "Comus" (ll. 859, 865):

Unhappy Hour, when first, in youthful Bud,  
I left the fair Sabrina's silver Flood!

His rival, Pope, echoed these lyrics in strange places. There is a "translucent wave" from "Comus," line 861, in his "Lines on his Grotto," and in his *Odyssey*, Book VII, line 10, may be found "cool, translucent springs" from the same source. In his *Iliad*, Book XVIII, line 64, a nereid appears wearing amber hair somewhat after Sabrina's mode (l. 863); and lastly in his "Lament of Glumdalclitch" (l. 48) we have a significant reminiscence of "Comus," lines 898-99, in the line:

Or in the golden cowslip's velvet head.

Moses Browne's seventh eclogue may be cited again for the resemblance of the following couplet to "Comus," line 825:

Of the smooth *Severn* I a Lay rehearse,  
And call the wave-rob'd Goddess to my Verse.

The beautiful epilogue of the Spirit in "Comus," with its description of

. . . those happy climes that lie  
Where day never shuts his eye,

is vaguely paralleled by a poetic passage from Mrs. Rowe's *Letters moral and entertaining* (1733), Letter X, in which the sylph Ariel describes the abode of sylphs. The resemblance is not minute; there is a similarity in the piling up of details.

This concludes the total of some forty parallels to "Comus" drawn from about twenty different writers.

#### D. "LYCIDAS"

Many of the ancient conventions of the pastoral elegy were so widely known in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that it is frequently difficult to tell whether a poet is harking back to "Lycidas" or to the Greek elegists or Virgil or Sannazaro. It has

been pointed out that Milton follows these earlier elegists very closely in passages.<sup>1</sup> The name "Lycidas," for instance, is used by Theocritus, Bion, Virgil, and Sannazaro, to name shepherds; hence similar uses by Gildon (*Miscellaneous Letters* [1694], p. 183), Mrs. Behn (*The Land of Love* [1717], p. 3), Broome ("Daphnis and Lycidas, A Pastoral"), Pope ("Winter"), Mrs. Rowe (Letter XX of her *Letters moral and entertaining*), and Aaron Hill ("Cleon to Lycidas") may mean nothing concerning the popularity of Milton. It seems clear, however, that Nicholas Rowe's "Stanzas to Lady Warwick on Mr. Addison's going to Ireland" apply the name to Addison with Miltonic implications; for Addison was a literary personage about to risk his life on the Irish seas, which had proved fatal to Milton's Lycidas. Some of the other works listed as using the name have additional echoes of Milton, but even this establishes only a probability of influence so far as the proper name is concerned.

Among the poems generally reminiscent of "Lycidas" are Fenton's "Florelio; a Pastoral lamenting the death of the late Marquis of Blandford" (ca. 1710), the anonymous poem signed "Comerus" in *Mist's Weekly-Journal* for September 10, 1720, and Moses Browne's fifth eclogue, "Renock's Despair. An Imitation of Milton's Lycidas" (1727, 1739). This last is by far the most important. Browne is evidently more concerned to copy the irregular rhyme recurrence and the varying meter than to echo Milton's details or phrases. His preface of 1739 is interesting because it is highly eulogistic of "Lycidas" and because he thinks himself its earliest imitator. His poem is the first avowed imitation that I have noticed; but the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1740 (X, 253), says the poem "is reckon'd the best Imitation of Milton's Lycidas that has yet appear'd"; implying, certainly, that it was not the only imitation. Probably Browne made his claim to priority in 1727—I have not seen the first edition of his preface. The poem contains practically no phrasal reminiscences of its avowed model.

In fact, there are rather surprisingly few sure phrasal imitations of the poem, considering the high praise we have seen it receiving.

<sup>1</sup> See Professor Hanford's study "The Pastoral Elegy and Milton's Lycidas" in *P.M.L.A.*, XXV (1910), 403-47.

The opening lines are recalled by a passage from the midst of Mrs. Rowe's poem "On the death of the Hon. Henry Thyne, Esq.":

Ye tender myrtles mourn, nor let your boughs  
Hereafter deck one joyful lover's brows.  
Ye folding bays, and laurel's sacred shade,  
At once let all your wreathing glories fade.

Hill's "Cleon to Lycidas" contains a passage that recalls line 10 and also the ecclesiastical satire of the poem:

Bid throb, the muse's pulse—for THY sweet call,  
What muse, uncharm'd, can hear? . . . .  
Bid the *priest Poet* consecrate the rage  
Of a wrong'd nation's curses.<sup>1</sup>

Others have seen a parallel between line 12 and Pope's *Odyssey*, Book XIV, line 155; the resemblance lies in the thing described and the word "welter," which is common to both. Pope is more clearly echoing Milton (l. 34) in his "Summer," line 50:

Rough satyrs dance, and Pan applauds the song.

Lines 50, 51, and 124 were obviously in Broome's mind when he wrote, in his poem "On the Death of my dear Friend Mr. Elijah Fenton" (1730):

Where were ye, Muses, by what fountain side,  
What river sporting, when your favourite dy'd?

Unlike those bards, who, uninformed to play,  
Grate on their jarring pipes a flashy lay . . . .<sup>2</sup>

Parnell seems in the following from "Piety" to be thinking of the noble passage where Milton (ll. 64-76) condemns such poets as celebrate Amaryllis or Neaera's hair:

. . . . . Be thy Muse thy zeal,  
Dare to be good, and all my joys reveal.  
While other pencils flattering forms create  
And paint the gaudy plumes that deck the great;  
While other pens exalt the vain delight,

<sup>1</sup> I am aware of Virgil's *neget quis carmina Gallo?* but the ecclesiastical reference added to the other seems to point to "Lycidas" rather than to Virgil's *Eclogues*, X, 3.

<sup>2</sup> The first of these couplets, of course, might have been inspired direct from Theocritus, but not the second.

Whose wasteful revel wakes the depth of night;  
 Or others softly sing in idle lines  
 How Damon courts, or Amaryllis shines;  
 More wisely thou select a theme divine,  
 Fame is their recompense, 'tis Heaven is thine.

The general doctrine together with the attitude toward Fame seems Miltonic. The proverbial line on fame (l. 71) was possibly copied by Marvell in his "Fleckno, an English Priest at Rome" (lines 27-28):

Only this frail ambition did remain,  
 The last distemper of the sober brain.

But of course the aphorism is much older than "Lycidas." The attendant advice "to scorn delights and live laborious days" (l. 72) found clearer echoes: Pope used the "laborious days" in his *Iliad*, Book IX, line 431; and Hamilton invoked "Contemplation" as follows:

Teach me to scorn, by thee refin'd,  
 The low delights of human kind:  
 Sure thine to put to flight the boy  
 Of laughter, sport, and idle joy.

Pope originally used another line from this general passage (l. 77) in the first form of line 131 of his "Essay on Criticism":

Ere warned Phoebus touched his trembling ears.

It is dangerous to try to point parallels to anything so conventional as the flower-list in "Lycidas"; but some passages seem worth risking. Pope in "Spring," line 31, makes his violets "glow" as did Milton (l. 145); Thomson ("Spring," ll. 448-49) makes "cowslips hang the dewy head" after "Lycidas," line 147, and possibly echoes line 151 in "Summer," lines 1522-23:

Bring every sweetest Flower, and let me strow  
 The Grave where Russel lies . . . .

The flower-list (ll. 107-20) in Ambrose Philips' third pastoral, which is an elegy, suggests Milton in some details, but not certainly the "Lycidas" passage.

The somewhat unusual use of nectar<sup>1</sup> in the immortalizing of Lycidas (l. 175) very likely is echoed in two lines from an anonymous

<sup>1</sup> On similar uses see Todd's note on "Comus," l. 838, *Poetical Works of Milton* (1809), VI, 372.

"Ode to my Lord D. of B——. An. Dom. 1704," printed in the *Oxford and Cambridge Miscellany* (1710), page 294:

And now they bathe in *Nectar* Streams,  
Nor need the Sun's officious Beams.

Lycidas' "oozy locks" in the same line seem to have hit Moses Browne's fancy; for in his metamorphosis of Glaucus into a sea god, he writes:

His scaly limbs outspread a larger space,  
And oozy locks his azure shoulders grace.

A last parallel may be noted between the first form of line 46 of Pope's "Messiah" and line 181 of "Lycidas." Pope wrote,

He wipes the tears for ever from our eyes,

which is certainly closer to "Lycidas" than to the original passage in Isaiah. This completes the list of not very satisfying parallels to "Lycidas." At most there are about two dozen of them from fifteen different writers.

#### E. OTHER MINOR POEMS

To emphasize the fact that practically all of Milton's poems had been levied upon by imitative poets before 1740, it is important to cite the parallels noted to his shorter pieces.

The "Vacation Exercise" (ll. 91 ff.) stimulated Pope and Moses Browne to imitation. Pope in his "Summer," line 2, and in "Windsor Forest," line 340, uses "Thame" for "Thames" (cf. Milton, l. 100); and in "Windsor Forest," lines 346-47, he borrows other riparian details:

The gulphy Lee his sedgy tresses rears;  
And sullen Mole, that hides his diving flood.

Browne in his eclogue "The Strife" has a river-list of record length in which all Milton's rivers are embodied. In footnotes he refers to the "Vacation Exercise" and to "Lycidas," line 55. His descriptions of or notes on the Thames, the Mole, the Avon, the Trent, the Lea and the Dee are all in some way conscious of Milton's rivers.

It is less surprising to find the "Nativity Ode" echoed. Lines 21 and 114 possibly find imitation in line 894 of Samuel Wesley's "Epistle . . . concerning poetry" (1700):

Tho Virtue's glittering Squadrons drive the Field.

From line 46 Hamilton probably derived "meek-ey'd" Charity for his poem "Contemplation," just as Pope made the nuns in "Eloisa," line 21, "pale-ey'd" in remembrance of Milton's "pale-ey'd priest" (l. 180). Grosart has pointed out that the tail of Milton's "Old Dragon" (l. 172) inspired lines 151-52 of Marvell's "First Anniversary of the Government under his Highness the Lord Protector":

And starrs still fall, and still the dragon's tail  
Swinges the volumes of its horrid flail.

Lines 173-78 are perhaps facetiously alluded to when the *Weekly-Journal: or Saturday's Post* (Mist) for August 9, 1718 (p. 519) remarks on the fact that "the Athenian Oracle is ceased and his Godship Apollo is become dumb."<sup>1</sup>

Todd has cited two interestingly early parallels in his notes to lines 229 ff. The first one reads:

All the purple pride that laces  
The crimson curtains of thy bed

[Crashaw, *Sacred Poems*, ed. Paris, 1652, p. 17].

The second, Todd introduces by saying that Thomas Forde in his *Fragmenta Poetica* (1660)

has given us several poems on Christmas Day, in one or two of which he adopts some sentiments and expressions in this sublime and wonderful Ode; betraying, however, a want of genuine taste and fancy in affected emendation or ridiculous expansion. For example, in p. 7,

What made the sun post hence away  
So fast, and make so short a day?  
Seeing a brighter sun appear,  
He ran and hid himself for fear:  
Asham'd to see himself out-shined,  
(Leaving us and night behind,)  
He sneaked away to take a nap,  
And hide himself in Thetis lap.

Pope's "Dunciad," Book II, lines 341-42, is obviously indebted to "Arcades," lines 30-31:

As under seas Alpheus' secret sluice  
Bears Pisa's off'rings to his Arethuse.

A few parallels to the sonnets are notable. Steele in his *Poetical Miscellanies* (1714, 1727) printed some anonymous verses "To

<sup>1</sup> The "Athenian Oracle," of course, here means the collection of questions and answers reprinted under the title at least as early as 1704 from the *Athenian Mercury* (1691-96).

Aristus, in imitation of a sonnet of Milton." The "bloomy spray" of the nightingale sonnet figures with song birds in line 23 of Pope's "Spring" and in Ambrose Philips' lines "To Miss Charlotte Pulteney. (May 1, 1724)." Dyer's "Country Walk" (l. 135) has a "bloomy mead." Pope's "Imitation of Martial" glances at the phrasing of Milton's sonnet "On his being arrived to the age of twenty-three" in the following lines:

. . . . While time with still career  
Wafts on his gentle wing his eightieth year.

A parallel pointed out between the same sonnet and the "Dunciad," Book IV, line 6, seems insignificant.

This ends our citation of parallels as evidence of interest in Milton's early poems. Any mathematical summary of such things is dangerous, because one may easily multiply parallels by counting a single passage twice or three times. Without doing this, and without including Robert Baron's work—in which the parallels are too frequent for counting—it may be said that roughly we have here cited something like one hundred and sixty-five parallels from about fifty different authors, though some anonymous poems may be by the same author and thus cut down our totals. These parallels are drawn from over a hundred different works.

#### IV

From the evidence here presented with regard to editions, mentions of the poems in various places, and parallels found in later poems or prose, it may be concluded that the "neglect" of the minor poems before 1740 has been somewhat exaggerated. Certainly the Warton brothers overstated the case. I have cited almost a hundred writers who showed consciousness of these poems in the first century of their existence; from these ninety-odd persons almost two hundred works have been cited, and in these only three passages have taken a slighting attitude toward the poems—those by Saumaise, Dryden, and William Benson. Considering the size of the reading public and the state of letters in general, these two hundred poems, biographies, letters, essays, etc., seem a not inconsiderable amount. Nor is the quality of the attention given the poems less impressive than the quantity. It is probable that after the Restoration Milton's literary credit temporarily declined—as

his political credit certainly did; but after the period when Toland's *Life* was written, the reputation of the minor poems is undoubted.

Of the great vogue the poems came to enjoy in the middle of the eighteenth century, something has already been said. The writer may perhaps add two very strong personal impressions that have arisen in his mind from reading much of the poetry inspired by Milton's early pieces. The first is that the vogue of the poems after 1730 was greatly quickened by the fact that Thomson's "Seasons" had made very frequent and successful levies upon them; consequently the mid-century vogue may be in part a tribute to Thomson rather than to Milton. In the second place, it seems doubtful whether this increased interest in the poems was a blessing to English poetry. The more poetry of the time one reads, the more doubtful one becomes. The sentimental twilight poems, the feebly grotesque night-pieces that follow in Milton's train are as a rule not highly creditable to their authors. Some of Gray's worst phrases come directly from these poems and their kind. On the other hand, it is of course true that he, and some few others—very few—got genuine inspiration from Milton's minor poems. The idea that poetry was debased by this copying of Milton is not original with the present writer. The following satire on the sort of Miltonism fostered by Dodsley and his *Collection of Poems* will show the opinion of one observer in 1763. The verses<sup>1</sup> are entitled "To a Gentleman, who desired proper materials for a monody":

Flowrets—wreaths—thy banks along—  
 Silent eve—th' accustom'd song—  
 Silver-slipper'd—whilom—lore—  
 Druid—Paynim—mountain hoar—  
 Dulcet—hermite—what time—  
 ("Excuse me—here I want a rhyme.")  
 Black-brow'd night—Hark! scratch-owls sing!  
 Ebon car—and raven wing—  
 Charnel houses—lonely dells—  
 Glimmering tapers—dismal cells—  
 Hallow'd haunts—and horrid piles—  
 Roseate hues—and ghastly smiles—  
 Solemn fanes—and cypress bowers—  
 Thunder-storms—and tumbling towers—  
 Let these be well together blended—  
 Dodsley's your man—the poem's ended.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

GEORGE SHERBURN

<sup>1</sup> They are quoted from the Fawkes-Woty *Poetical Calendar* (1763), V, 111.

## THE BEOWULF CODEX

In the MS volume Cotton Vitellius A XV the three prose tracts immediately preceding the *Beowulf* epic are clearly the work of a single scribe. Furthermore, and what is of greater interest, the script in which they are written is no other than the well-known first hand of *Beowulf*. This fact, until recently unrecorded, gives to the three prose pieces an added importance which will justify, it is reasonable to expect, a re-examination of the texts.

Neither the texts nor the hands in which they are written, however, can profitably be discussed until a clear idea of the state of the MS is presented. So well known a codex as that which contains the *Beowulf* epic ought, it would seem, to have been carefully and correctly described by at least one of the scholars in whose hands it has been; yet such is the neglect of paleographic details that even this celebrated MS volume has yet to be accurately described. At so late a date as 1916, appears in print<sup>1</sup> an inaccuracy as to the foliation. It seems, accordingly, advisable to remove the confusion at once by a detailed account of the MS. Two separate codices, both small quarto on vellum, have been bound together since the time of Sir Robert Cotton to make the present volume. The first, in two main hands of the twelfth century, contains four articles: *Flowers from St. Augustine's Soliloquies*, translated by King Alfred, fol. 4a; *Gospel of Nicodemus*, fol. 60a; *Dialogue between Solomon and Saturn*, fol. 84b; and a fragment of eleven lines concerning martyrs, fol. 93b. The second codex, likewise in two hands, but of considerably earlier date, consists of five articles: a fragment of the *Life of St. Christopher*, imperfect at the beginning, fol. 94a; *Wonders of the East*, fol. 98b; *Letter of Alexander the Great to Aristotle*, fol. 107a; *Beowulf*, fol. 132a; and *Judith*, fols. 202a-209b.

With the first three tracts of this second codex we are here principally concerned. They are written in a bold, easily legible

<sup>1</sup> K. Sisam, *Mod. Lang. Review*, XI, 335. Mr. Sisam's statement that "the numbering of blank dividing leaves advances the foliation by three" is incorrect, as is shown in a later paragraph.

hand, there being, with two exceptions, twenty lines to a full page.<sup>1</sup> The second of the three pieces is curiously illustrated with numerous water-color sketches of no great merit. The MS is otherwise quite unadorned, the capitals throughout the codex being large, plain letters in the ink of the text. The vermilion pigment of the pictures has in several places left its trace on the adjacent page, the most prominent instance being a stain on folio 95b (94b) which corresponds exactly to an illustration on folio 102 (95). From this, as well as from the older foliation given here in parentheses,<sup>2</sup> it is obvious that these two pages were at one time bound in immediate sequence. The margins of the volume were so badly charred in the fire of 1731 that many letters at the beginning and end of a line were either distorted or scorched past recognition. Of the charred portion much was lost by the gradual crumbling away of the fragile edge of the burned parchment—a loss which a modern binder has put a stop to by fitting each leaf into a frame of heavy paper. Zupitza's autotypes of *Beowulf* give an excellent idea of the state of the MS. It is impossible, however, even in the best facsimile, to reproduce the actual condition of the burned margins. The parchment has in many places become transparent, with the result that letters often show through the leaf in a manner which has confused more than one editor of the several texts. In many instances whole words that appear totally obliterated may be deciphered by looking at the MS against a strong light. The transparent paper used by the binder in repairing the crumbling edges of the text hides numerous letters in the facsimile which are easily seen in the MS itself. Some letters, or parts of letters, however, are unavoidably hidden by the heavy paper of the new margin. Occasionally the effect of the charring is such that letters may be recognized only by *reducing* the quantity of light and allowing it to pass through the glazed parchment at a certain angle. A lens is of little use. Infinite patience, and a willingness to read and to re-read the MS under different atmospheric conditions, are the essential needs of the editor of these texts. The margin alone, however, is difficult to read, the central portion of every leaf being for the most part easily legible.

<sup>1</sup> Fol. 125b has 21 lines; fol. 111b but 19.

<sup>2</sup> For foliation cf. pp. 543–45 below.

Still another point to be considered in a full description of the MS volume is its threefold foliation. Ward, in his *Catalogue of Romances*, Volume I, gives as the first page of *Alexander's Letter* fol. 109a. In Volume II of the same *Catalogue*, the same article is said to begin at fol. 107a. In Volume I, the eleven-line fragment on martyrs is assigned to fol. 94b; in Volume II, to fol. 90b. In fact, there is but one point of agreement in this matter between Ward's first and second volumes, and that is the citation of fol. 4a as the page on which the *Flowers from St. Augustine's Soliloquies* begins. The ten years' interval between the publication of the two volumes cannot account for the discrepancies, as no alteration in the foliation or binding of the codex was made during that time. Cockayne<sup>1</sup> and Baskervill<sup>2</sup> number the leaves of the MS still differently, both placing the first line of *Alexander's Letter* at fol. 104a. Such is the confusion that equally good printed authority is found for putting the beginning of *Beowulf* at fol. 129a, at fol. 132a, and at fol. 134a. The explanation of this discrepancy is quite simple. Long after the fire of 1731 the leaves of the volume were numbered consecutively in ink, that leaf being counted as fol. 1 on which begins the *Flowers from St. Augustine's Soliloquies*. Three leaves immediately preceding this article were ignored. This is the earliest foliation,<sup>3</sup> and the one referred to by Cockayne and Baskervill in their editions of *Alexander's Letter*, and by Zupitza in his autotype edition of *Beowulf*. The numbers, easily seen in the autotypes, were written as near to the upper right-hand corner of the recto side of the leaves as their charred condition would permit. *Alexander's Letter*, according to this numbering, begins at fol. 104a; *Beowulf*, at fol. 129a. Reference to this oldest foliation is made in parenthesis in the present paper. The later foliations, made after the leaves had been framed in paper and rebound, are easily accounted for. In the first place, the three leaves at the beginning of the volume, unnumbered in the old foliation, were rightly included in the new. The first of these three leaves has since been removed to MS. Royal 13 D I\*; the second

<sup>1</sup> *Narratiunculæ anglicæ conscriptæ*, London, 1861.

<sup>2</sup> "The Anglo-Saxon Version of the 'Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotilem,'" *Anglia*, IV, 139.

<sup>3</sup> Previous to the fire there may have been a still earlier foliation. Wanley (1705) gives the foliation substantially as it was after the fire, but whether from his own counting of the leaves or from another's numbering is uncertain.

contains an *Elenchus Contentorum* in which, oddly enough, there is no mention of *Beowulf*; the third contains some rough notes on parishes, etc., in England and on various events that occurred in 1346, 1383, and 1453. The inclusion of these leaves in the foliation advances the folio numbers by three, so that *Alexander's Letter* begins at fol. 107a and *Beowulf* at fol. 132a. This foliation—the one to which reference is made throughout this contribution, and which is used by Ward in Volume II of his *Catalogue of Romances*—is written in pencil in the upper right-hand corner of the recto side of the new paper margins, as it should be. It is not shown in Zupitza's autotypes. It is to be hoped that this foliation will hereafter be employed by those who refer to the MS. In the second place, not only the first three leaves, but also two blank paper leaves inserted by the binder between fols. 59 (56) and 60 (57), and between fols. 93 (90) and 94 (91), were counted in still another foliation. This, used by Ward in Volume I of his *Catalogue*, is written in pencil in the lower recto margins. It is not to be recommended as a means of reference, its effect being to advance the oldest foliation in some places by three, in others by four, and in still others by five. The transfer of fol. 1 to another MS creates the possibility of yet another numbering of the leaves. If we neglect the two recently inserted blank sheets of paper, there are at present in the codex 208 leaves. It ends with fol. 209b (206b).

Not only has the foliation been changed, but also the relative position of the leaves. Their sequence in the earlier binding of the volume was quite wrong. In fact, so little did the first binder understand the material with which he was dealing that he dovetailed the *St. Christopher* fragment with the *Wonders of the East* and interchanged two gatherings of eight leaves in *Alexander's Letter*. The foliation of *Alexander's Letter*—despite Wülker's erroneous statement<sup>1</sup> that "die Blätter sind jetzt in der hs. in ihre richtige Ordnung gebracht"—is still to be corrected. For the correct sequence of the subject-matter, fols. 110–17 should exchange place with fols. 118–25. This has been done by Cockayne, Baskervill, and in the edition now in preparation by the present writer. The leaves of the two other pieces, however, have been properly rearranged by the latest binder,

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, I, 508, note.

throwing the old foliation into so chaotic a state that it can no longer be conveniently used. Just what the present arrangement is may be clearly seen from the following table. The original gatherings, of course, cannot now be determined, the threads and margins being new throughout the codex.

Present Foliation	Old Foliation
94	93
95	94
96	91
97	92
98	97
99	98
100	99
101	100
102	95
103	96
104	101
105	102 (?)
106	103
107-130	104-127

From this detailed account of the MS we may now turn to a consideration of the script. It has for some time been recognized that *Judith* and the second portion of *Beowulf* are written in the same hand, but until quite recently no notice has been taken of the fact that the first 1939 lines of *Beowulf* and the three articles immediately preceding the epic in the MS volume are the work of a single scribe. Professor Sedgefield is the first to note<sup>1</sup> the identity of the hand of *Alexander's Letter* and the first hand of *Beowulf*. Mr. Kenneth Sisam points out<sup>2</sup> that this identity extends also to the hand of the *St. Christopher* fragment and of the *Wonders of the East*, and that certain conclusions depend upon this fact. No other writer, of the many who have examined the MS, has called attention to this important feature. Of the identity of the hands there can be no real doubt. For those who have access to the MS, however, special attention may be drawn to the letter *k* (cf. *kynnes*, fol. 126a, l. 19, and *kyning*, autotypes, fol. 144a, l. 12); to the letter *s*, the shorter

<sup>1</sup> *Beowulf*, 2d ed., p. xiv, note.

<sup>2</sup> *Mod. Lang. Review*, XI, 335.

form of which is used throughout the texts; to the *æg* ligature (cf. fol. 126a, l. 20 and autotypes, fol. 130b, l. 19); to the "spreading" *y*, found occasionally both in *Alexander's Letter* and in *Beowulf* (cf. *ytemestum*, fol. 109a, l. 3 and *ymb*, autotypes, fol. 129a, l. 9); to the capital letter *M*, which occurs in two forms, one with four straight strokes, the other a fanciful form with the first and last strokes curved. This use of differently formed capitals is no indication of change of scribe. It is common enough, even today, to see such a letter as capital *S* variously written on a single page. Should the two types of capital be found respectively confined to separate articles, then, with reason, one might suspect the two articles to be the work of different scribes. This, however, is not the case. The usual form of the capital *M* in *Alexander's Letter* is the one with curved stems, but there also occurs (cf. fol. 109b, l. 7 and fol. 122a, l. 7) the identical straight-stroke capital *M* used in the *St. Christopher* fragment and in *Beowulf* (cf. autotypes, fol. 171a, l. 16). Furthermore, it must be remembered that a scribe's hand varies from page to page, so that to the unaccustomed eye it may often seem to be the work of more than one writer. Compare, for example, in Zupitza's autotypes, the recto and the verso of fol. 144; or fol. 129b with fol. 133b. The difference is obvious. Yet no one doubts that these contrasted pages were written by one scribe only. A similar contrast is seen on the MS pages of the three texts under discussion. It is this, doubtless, which has caused the identity of the script to be overlooked hitherto.

In addition to these paleographic considerations there is yet other evidence, which, if not conclusive, is at least corroborative. There is an indication that the last five pieces in MS Cotton Vitellius A XV formed at one time a book by themselves. If this be so, the likelihood of their being written by more than two scribes is lessened. One scribe, apparently, started to make a book, probably to order. He got as far as the middle of his fourth article (l. 1939 of *Beowulf*), when something occurred to prevent his completion of the book. It was finished by a second copyist. The evidence is twofold. In the first place, at the top of fol. 94a (93a), the first page<sup>1</sup> of the codex, and the beginning of the *St. Christopher* fragment,

<sup>1</sup> It was once bound as the third leaf of the fragment, as the old foliation still shows.

is written, "Laurence Nouell A. 1563."<sup>1</sup> Nowell, Dean of Lichfield, acquired the MS, apparently, in its present incomplete condition, and put his name, as was but natural, on the outside page. Secondly, we have the testimony of Wanley, who, in his catalogue of 1705, says of *Alexander's Letter*: "Hoc autem exemplar cum 3 superioribus,<sup>2</sup> . . . fuit peculium doctiss. viri Laurentii Nowelli. a.d. 1563." Whether or not Wanley had other evidence than we possess today is not known, but his statement is of corroborative value. That the three prose tracts, accordingly, formed part of a single volume and were written by a single scribe may well be assumed. That they originally formed part of the volume which contained *Beowulf* is indicated only by paleographic considerations—the size and shape of the page, the foliation, the undoubted identity of the script. In fact, this identity of the script is proof sufficient, the other considerations being merely supplementary.

The recognition that fols. 94a-175b, l. 4, are written in the same hand necessitates a correction in the dating of the prose pieces. The *Beowulf* MS is accepted by all authorities as a work of about 1000.<sup>3</sup> Yet the three prose pieces are variously assigned to the eleventh and even to the twelfth century.<sup>4</sup> Obviously, if *circa* 1000 is to be kept as the date of the *Beowulf* portion of the codex, *circa* 1000 must also be accepted as the date of the prose tracts written by one of the *Beowulf* scribes. A correction must also be made, in view of the identity of the scripts, in certain accepted theories regarding the *Beowulf* scribes. Discussion of this important matter, however, must be reserved for the full treatment it deserves in a separate article.

STANLEY I. RYPINS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

<sup>1</sup> The "3" is now gone and has been supplied in pencil.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., cum 2 superioribus; viz., *St. Christopher* and *Wonders of the East* (?).

<sup>3</sup> W. Keller (*Palæstra*, Vol. XLIII, No. 1, p. 37), on paleographic grounds, puts the *Beowulf* MS "in die letzten Decennien des 10. Jahrhunderts."

<sup>4</sup> Knappe, Greifswald dissertation, p. 8, puts the *St. Christopher* fragment roughly in the eleventh century, and the two following pieces more definitely in the middle of the eleventh century. Förster, *Archiv*, CXVII, 367, puts *Wonders of the East* in the twelfth century. Ward assigns *Alexander's Letter* to the late tenth century.



## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

*Richard Rolle of Hampole's Mending of Life.* WILLIAM HENRY HULME. Western Reserve University Bulletins, New Series, Vol. XXI, No. 4, May, 1918.

Professor Hulme has here printed an edition of a Middle English translation of Rolle's Latin tract, the *De Emendatione Vitae*, from a rotograph of Worcester Cathedral MS F. 172. Richard Misyn's translation of the same Latin tract has been published by Harvey for the Early English Text Society, and modernized by Miss F. M. Comper; but the translation here printed is in a different dialect, and probably of later and independent origin. Rolle wrote the *De Emendatione Vitae* some time before 1349. Misyn wrote his Middle English translation in 1434 (E.E.T.S., Vol. 106, p. 131), and the Worcester manuscript from which this translation is printed dates from the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Misyn's translation is very literal, and therefore of little beauty: as a Middle English tract it has none of the charm of those pieces which Rolle himself wrote in, or turned into, the vernacular; for Misyn construed the Latin rather than translated it. The Worcester manuscript translation, however, in the dialect of the southern Midlands, is much freer, and of greater literary merit. The two translations are to some extent examples of the rival theories of translation which perplexed Europe at the end of the fourteenth century, when so many Latin textbooks were being rendered into the national tongues—the theories that translation should be “according to the letter” or “according to the sentence,” or meaning. The author of the *General Prologue* to the second version of the Wycliffite Old Testament dealt with this point in a familiar passage, as did a contemporary translator, or reviser, of certain Tuscan gospels: “Holy scripture speaks in many places like the centre of a wheel, . . . and there are words which should be supplied to help the unlettered: and so that others may not misunderstand, and believe that the meaning of the text is changed when I supply or explain a word, which shall be necessary, and where it is understood, I underline such words and sentences.”<sup>1</sup> Rolle himself had felt the difficulty in his translation of the text of the psalter, and though his translation was usually very stiff and literal, in places he “followed the wit of the words.” Misyn's translation is, in fact, a curiously late specimen of the earlier school; and its stiffness, in contrast with the freer style of the Worcester translation, renders the interval between the making of the two

<sup>1</sup> *Romania*, XXIII, 408.

translations apparently greater than the fifty years which probably separated them.

In certain notes on the other treatises which accompany the *Mending of Life* in the Worcester manuscript, Professor Hulme makes suggestions on which he would scarcely have ventured, had he access to the manuscripts of Rolle's Middle English tracts and to those of the two versions of the Wycliffite Bible as printed by Forshall and Madden. The Worcester MS F. 172 contains *inter alia*: (1) the psalter in the second Wycliffite version, as printed by Forshall and Madden;<sup>1</sup> (2) parts of what is, apparently unknown to Professor Hulme, the *General Prologue* to the Wycliffite Old Testament, also printed by Forshall and Madden; (3) part of Rolle's prologue to his version of the psalter, printed by Bramley<sup>2</sup> and by Forshall and Madden (I, 39-40); and (4) the second version of the Wycliffite *Acts of the Apostles*, as printed by Forshall and Madden (IV, 507-93). Professor Hulme, on the strength of the presence in the manuscript of Rolle's prologue to the psalter, attributes the second Wycliffite psalter to him also, and, not content with this, would be pleased to claim for Rolle the authorship of the whole second Wycliffite version of the Bible: "If Richard Rolle was the author of the latter [the second Wycliffite psalter], which seems almost certain, then he was of course the author of the 'later' so-called Wycliffite version, which would accordingly be the earlier instead of the later version" (p. 13). The fact, which Professor Hulme notices, that this manuscript does not contain Rolle's commentary on the psalter, should have made him chary of so startling a suggestion; the English text of Rolle's psalter is well authenticated, and quite distinct from the second Wycliffite translation, as can be seen by comparing Bramley's edition of Rolle's psalter with the second Wycliffite psalter as printed by Forshall and Madden. All the early manuscripts of Rolle's psalter are accompanied by his commentary and are in the northern dialect. Apart from the fact that we possess the undoubted text of Rolle's psalter, it would be very rash to attribute to him a different text of the psalter, because in a late fifteenth-century manuscript it is accompanied by Rolle's (and another) prologue to that book.

Again, the prologues to the five books of Wisdom, printed by Professor Hulme as Rolle's on pages 16-18, are actually part of the *General Prologue* to the Old Testament in the second Wycliffite version, and are printed by Forshall and Madden (I, 37-41). Rolle's prologue to the psalter is found in another manuscript in connection with the *General Prologue*, as Forshall and Madden notice (I, 40).

Similarly, Professor Hulme's suggestion (p. 25) that the *Acts of the Apostles* of the second Wycliffite version "may have had in its origin some

<sup>1</sup> *The Holy Bible . . . made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers*, ed. by J. Forshall and F. Madden (Oxford, 1850), II, 739-888.

<sup>2</sup> *The Psalter . . . with a Translation and Exposition in English by Richard Rolle of Hampole*, H. R. Bramley (1884), p. 3.

connection with Rolle of Hampole" cannot be taken seriously. There is no manuscript of the second Wycliffite version till between forty and fifty years after Rolle's death, and no early manuscript of this version is in the northern dialect. The whole question of Rolle's Middle English works will soon be cleared up by the forthcoming work of Dr. Hope Emily Allen, whose book has been unfortunately delayed by the war.

It should be noticed that the reference numbers inserted by W. Thomas in the Worcester manuscript, mentioned by Professor Hulme (p. 9), are from the *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae*, Bernard, Oxford, 1697; and that information about Nicholas Love, the Carthusian prior of Mount Grace in 1409, which is desiderated by Professor Hulme on page 8, is accessible in an article on "Mount Grace Priory," by H. V. Le Bas, in the *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal*, XVIII, 264.

M. DEANESLY

NEWNHAM COLLEGE  
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

---

*A Study of William Shenstone and of His Critics, with Fifteen of His Unpublished Poems and Five of His Unpublished Latin Inscriptions.* By ALICE I. HAZELTINE. Menasha, Wisconsin, 1918.

This study was occasioned by Shenstone manuscripts owned by Professor George Herbert Palmer of Harvard, from which are drawn the slender additions to the poet's output here printed for the first time. The writer purposes to defend Shenstone's personality and work from injustices done him by Dr. Johnson, Mason, and others. Although injustice is here sometimes done to Dr. Johnson, Miss Hazeltine's explanation of how Johnson deduced the dilapidation of Leasowes from Shenstone's own lines is a just and skilful piece of work. The argumentative style is on occasion weakened by use of exclamation, rhetorical question, and a tone of pity for one's opponents (e.g., pp. 42, 51). The whole study is frankly and excessively partisan. Otherwise it is commendable.

G. S.

---

*A Geographical Dictionary of Milton.* By ALLAN H. GILBERT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919. Pp. viii+322.

This volume of the Cornell Studies in English, a part of which was accepted at Cornell as Mr. Gilbert's doctoral dissertation, does perhaps even more than its title indicates. The author says (p. vii):

I have given in alphabetic order the place-names in Milton's prose and poetry (except the addresses of the *Letters of State* and the Biblical quotations in *De*

*Doctrina Christiana*), and have endeavored so to explain these names, especially those occurring in the verse, as to reveal something of what they meant to the poet himself. To this end, I have drawn the quotations, so far as possible, from books he actually read. When this has been impossible, I have quoted from representative books accessible to him.

We have thus not mere explanations of place-names but frequently valuable annotations of poetic passages. Good examples are found under the headings of *Malabar*, *Punic Coast*, and *Severn*. Upon cursory examination the work seems done with commendable care; it should prove very useful.

G. S.

---

*Englishmen for My Money, or a Woman Will Have Her Will.* By WILLIAM HAUGHTON. Edited with Introduction and Notes by ALBERT CROLL BAUGH. Philadelphia, 1917. Pp. 236.

This University of Pennsylvania dissertation is an excellent bit of editing. The text is carefully reprinted from the best sheets of the copies of the quarto, with a few corrections and with a full record of the variants in a number of the copies of the three quartos. The notes are few but in the main adequate. A satisfactory account of Haughton's place in the history of Elizabethan drama is given in the Introduction, which contains a study of the conventions of the play and its influence on the rise of the type of realistic comedy that deals with London life; a survey of the lost plays and of the few extant plays written in conjunction with others; and an excellent re-examination of the problems in this connection, such as that of Haughton's relation to *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, and the authorship of *Grim the Collier of Croydon*.

C. R. B.

---

*A Subject-Index to the Poems of Edmund Spenser.* By CHARLES HUNTINGTON WHITMAN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918. Pp. xi+261.

This work, published under the auspices of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, furnishes a valuable reference book for students of Spenser, and incidentally for students of Elizabethan science, topography, mythology, etc. The index includes practically every term, general or specific, under which passages or themes of Spenser's work might be grouped, and the citation of Spenserian passages seems to be nearly exhaustive. Cross-references render it easy to follow a general subject. Explanations are given of the meaning of various terms as used by Spenser and of the place or function, allegorical or other, of characters in Spenser's works. Withal, the volume is a good specimen of artistic bookmaking.

C. R. B.

g  
e  
t  
f  
e  
e  
s  
r  
  
s  
e,  
  
of  
r,  
y,  
er  
ne  
s-  
re  
or  
ne